

THE  
MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1854.

---

ART. I.—SPIRIT OF THE AGE.\*

IN obedience to your call, I am here this evening to share with you in your first anniversary festival in this city, in honor of the distinguished Scholar, whose name as a Society you bear. And you will allow me first of all, to congratulate you in view of the circumstances of promise and hope under which we are assembled, and your deliverance from the dangers and anxieties incident upon your transplantation to this place. For one, whose hopes have been long and largely invested in the College with which you stand connected, as also in the Societies subject to her maternal care, their history for the last four years has been to me the object of untiring yea, increasing solicitude. I have rejoiced with their friends, as it passed through its brighter phases, and have shared in the common despondency which attended its darker transits. And now that the night of uncertainty is past and the day-spring of a prosperous future has begun to arise, I may be permitted to render with you, my tribute of rejoicing, and praise to the merciful Dispenser of all our prosperity—that wise Restorer of order and harmony, out of the deepest discords of confusion and noise.

Yet to one whose home is in the past history of your Society, the greetings of this evening are not unmingled with the gentler sentiments of sorrow. For how can he forget his part-

---

\* An Address delivered before the Goethean Literary Society of Franklin and Marshall College, at its first Anniversary in the city of Lancaster, Pa., on the 29th of August, 1853.

ners in the joys and sorrows of other days. How, amid the festivities of this occasion, is his spirit prone to steal back within itself, and wander away to the scenes made glad by the communion of those who now are scattered and far away. To me, this very anniversary meeting is largely freighted with melancholy associations. For with the rapidity of thought, it bears me over a nine years interval, and places me where then I stood surrounded with countenances lighted up with joy, a witness to the laying of the corner stone of the proudest monument of your history as a Society. And even now I seem to be there, and live over again the happy 28th of August, 1844. That was a day of gladness to us. To *us*—you will allow me to say; for though I was but an adopted son of the Gæthean Society, I found her an affectionate mother, and I early learned to love her. To *us* it was a happy day. For we reached its rejoicing through the labors of many a weary day and anxious night. Even now again I seem to see those youthful laborers, as relief after relief toiled out their allotted hours, that the sweat of their own brows might attest their zeal and self-sacrificing energy. I wander again in that overshadowing and now deserted grove; I listen to the entertainments of that day; and I hear once more the click of the builder's hammer. But now methinks, all is quiet and desolate. And I may not leave that much loved spot, without once more paying my tribute at his lonely grave, to the memory of the loved, but *not* lost—the lamented Dr. Rauch.

Gentlemen: This page of your Society's history stands graven upon the hearts of that generation of her membership. You may have valued that edifice, for its beauty, its convenience, and the honor it reflected upon the Gæthean name. But they *loved* it as the fruit of their toils, the monument of their sacrifices and the glad consummation of their cherished hopes. You will not, therefore, think it strange, that they still delight to ponder over the history of that deserted hall, and lament the necessity which required you to abandon it. As a homestead becomes doubly dear in virtue of the almost sacred associations of earlier years, so that hall is to them, as the home of their youthful affections.

We would not have you suppose, however, that these feelings of attachment to the associations of other days, bespeak a reprobation of the policy which has transplanted Marshall College and her Societies to this city, as unwise and extravagant. The sacrifices which have been incurred, were not only unavoidable in their circumstances, but are to be regarded as the necessary results of their expanding history. The essential interest is preserved—is more than preserved; and finds itself conducted to an advanced stadium in its onward progress. The substantial living *idea*, is that for which we are at all times bound to be concerned, in all institutions. This, in obedience to the laws of a growing history, must ever actualize itself in the world, in the form of some outward organization; and appropriate to itself such instrumentalities as may be necessary for its *living* activity, from the general store-house of nature. The outward form of organization is always, however, conditioned by the stage of development to which the idea or inner life, may at any time have attained. Hence the form is never commensurate with the idea, unless all historical progress has been completed, and absolute perfection reached. At any given period then of this evolution, the outward form is expected to subserve the life as a temporary instrumentality merely, to be thrown aside or superceded by a higher form of organization, as this may be rendered necessary by its fuller development. Any institution of whatever character, involves an idea including all that can ever be evolved, and in most cases vastly more than is ever realized in fact. At first, its outward organization will correspond with its infantile state. As this is transcended—as its powers are drawn out, the existing appliances become inadequate to its wants, and an organization commensurate with its growth and expanding faculties, becomes indispensable. The infantile must give place to a more mature and developed form, else must the institution itself suffer injury for want of facilities to give exercise to its extended powers of activity.

Marshall College, as also her literary Societies, in the earlier phases of their history, found the organization under which

they then existed, for the most part commensurate with their powers and necessities. But as these in a short time far outstripped in their growth, their outward circumstances—it being found impossible to secure means and instrumentalities adapted to their increasing inward resources and outward difficulties—it became most painfully apparent to their friends, that they must fall back and languish in their infantile state, and thus fail to accomplish the mission manifestly allotted to them, or in their attempt to advance in the prosecution of this, without the necessary means, meet with a most disastrous failure and final overthrow. They were cramped by the want of an organization equal to their powers and responsibilities; and this want could not be met under the circumstances by which they were held bound. They were like a frail bark cast into the midst of a stormy ocean, where no resources of skill and experience could compensate for its weakness, and its insufficiency for the wild waves with which it was tossed. It must either put back at the expense of its intended enterprise, or rush forward to inevitable destruction. Though that bark may be endeared to us by many an association of toil and anxiety—by many a season of rejoicing and many a realized hope, yet would it bespeak weakness to refuse its exchange for one better suited to the necessities of its mission. As a Society, together with your twin sister, you have it to lament for the sacrifice which is required of you; for you resign the noblest monument of your labor and spirit of enterprise. Yet are you enabled to rejoice in the possession of all that they reveal—the spirit, the resolution, the all concluding and living idea, raised superior to your former embarrassments, with facilities for the ultimate realization of all, may we not hope, to which in vain you might else have striven to give expression.

But it is not meet that I consume your time in leafing over the history so familiar to you all. We rejoice together in the position which you occupy this day, and as is now more befitting, let us turn for a short season to the contemplation of a subject, which, while it will afford us an opportunity for the practical application of the principles, and mode of thought in



which you have been instructed, will also prove suggestive of the duties which devolve upon you, as candidates for the active relations of life. You will allow me accordingly to offer for your consideration, a few thoughts bearing upon the character of the times in which we live, and the dominant tendency which has come to obtain around us in the world, in the form of the *Spirit of the Age*.

To arrive at a correct judgment of the significancy of any given phase of history, it is necessary that it be contemplated in its relations to the general stream in which it flows. And this general stream too, must find its meaning in the unity of its ultimate tendency and design. The world from its beginning to its end, is the embodiment of a comprehensive plan, concluding and gathering all things in one. Its movements and counter-movements, its ebb and flow, its gentler meanderings of peaceful life, and the torrent waves of its revolutions, are all held tributary to an onward progress—all steadily minister to the accomplishment of its controlling idea and intention. At times indeed does the sun seem to go back upon the dial plate. History seems to flow back upon itself and lose all power for onward movement. But yet is not such its real character. Obstacles may be thrown into its channel, and retard for a while the progress of its waters. But this very delay, is but the accumulation of its powers—the gathering of its energies, before which at length, the hinderance must give way or be overwhelmed and destroyed. At such times the waters may overflow their banks, and spreading far inland work sad devastation and ruin, but so soon as the conflict is ended, and the opposition surmounted, do they rush back to their allotted channel and course onward to their ocean home.

History is the ever growing revelation of God's will concerning humanity. This revelation, however, as we discover it in the world around us, finds its occasion only in the disturbing element of sin. But for this, no place could have been found for it in its existing form. God's designs in his creation would have been reached without the painful experience to which humanity is, and to the end of time will be subjected.

But, sin rushing in upon it with its deranging and ruinous power, disturbed the inner harmony of its being, and tore it from its right relations to itself, and its God as the source of its life. Death was the immediate and dreadful result, and the full realization of this with all its horrors, was avoided only by the regeneration of that life in the person of our Saviour Jesus Christ. In Him—and eternal praises to his adorable name—was our human life raised from its degradation to the enjoyment of its intended communion with God. He was the perfect revelation of the Divine will towards man. He is the perennial fountain from which emanates the stream of true history, which flows forth to reanimate the world and cleanse it from all its pollution.

Humanity as thus redeemed, goes forth into the world to leaven it with its own sanctified life, and purge out the corruption of sin. This involves a process, and this process is what we mean by true history. In assimilating it to its own image, it must come into immediate collision with it, and grapple with it in the midst of its corruption. Hence we have conflict; for they are antagonistic interests. The steady progress of assimilation is ever and anon interrupted by obstacles interposed by sin, and these must not be avoided, but seized hold upon and demolished. Thus do we find the onward flow more or less retarded, until its energies may be brought in sufficient measure to bear for the destruction of these evil impediments. The surmounting of these, constitutes the historical problem of the age to which they belong. These vary in magnitude, and in the amount of historical force necessary to overcome them. Many resist with a feebler power, and the stream of history bears them away with but little agitation; others again make a stubborn and determined opposition, rallying to their support mighty agencies at their command in the evil world, and thousands of deluded advocates. Here is progress for a season held in check. The stream is thrown back upon itself and recoils in confusion from its contact upon the impediment. But still steady to its heavenly mission, its mighty powers are brought gradually into requisition, until at length the evil is

overmastered, and yields amid the crash and destruction of a revolution, while ruin and death mark the triumphant course of a victorious history. In such an event do we discern an epoch. Such was the overthrow of the old Roman civilization—such the Reformation of the sixteenth century—such the founding of our American liberties.

As just remarked, redeemed humanity, as the vitalizing energy of all true progress in the world, enters in the accomplishment of its mission, *into* the world in the midst of its corruption. It plunges to the very depths of its misery, that it may rescue it from the wildest of its wanderings. Its relation to the life of the natural world, must not be conceived of as an outward force acting upon it, but rather as having entered into this, so as to become to it a vitalizing principle. Its action is like leaven, transforming the whole mass into its own image, and purging out all uncongenial elements. As these foreign elements are brought under the eradicating power of this divine principle of history, conflict is the immediate issue; and in proportion as the action of this principle grows in intensity, does the conflict grow fiercer until its mastery is fairly gained. It must be borne in mind that human nature, in the inner temple of its life, is the scene of this strife. Now the dominant tendency of this nature, as it reveals itself in the form of thought, feeling and corresponding action—in a word, its *animus* in the midst of the conflict, is at any given period what we mean by the Spirit of the age.

With this definition we are prepared to enquire, *What is the Spirit of the age in which we live, its historical relations and significance?*

The present period must not be supposed to hold a fortuitous relation to the history of past ages. It is but its proper outbirth and natural fruit—the legitimate result which has thus far been reached, in the ever advancing solution of the problem of human life. So too the Spirit of the present age is not something accidental. It is rather the legitimate state of thought and feeling to which the world has been conducted by the conflict carried on in its bosom, between its own

natural corrupt life, and the redeemed humanity which has been brought to a living union with it, by the incarnation of the Second Person in the Trinity, and which is progressively transforming it into its own holy image. To solve the proposed question satisfactorily, we must take a very cursory retrospect of past history, marking well its under current, and the steady advancement of this towards the goal of its ultimate design.

The terrible result of man's fall was not only to break up the inner harmony of his nature, but as already said, to sunder it from its right relations to the source of its life and being. Thereby did he deny his allegiance to his God; and instead of peacefully revolving in the lawful orbit of his being, round his beneficent Creator as his true centre, he seized the reins of government in his own rebellious hands, and sought to order his own steps. Self-will came to be the rule of his actions, and self, the great centre around which he would have the whole world besides to move. In this attitude of rebellion, self was arrayed as the rival interest over against God. This was treason not only against his Creator, but equally against the constitution of his own nature. For only as humanity rests humbly and freely as a dependent upon God, is it true to its own inward necessities and law. To reclaim it from this false position both to its Maker and the inherent law of its own being, was the problem, the solution of which we have seen to be the burden of an advancing history.

This state of alienation from God involved for man the most abject slavery; standing as he did subject to the most imperious demands of allegiance and yet stripped of the last vestige of ability to comply. The law of his being which was but the will of God concerning him, even reiterated its threatening challenge to obedience, while he possessed no power to give a favorable response. In vain did self struggle to escape from its dominion, or seek to establish its antagonistic claims. This was the false position—this the bondage to a violated law—this the spiritual slavery from which he was to be redeemed.

Freedom, however, in its true sense, does not involve ex-

emption from the authority of law; this is rather its very first integral element. Only as the demands of the law of our being are fully met can we be said to be free. Our bodies, for illustration, are never free, never healthy, never exempt from pain and suffering, only as every organ acts in most rigid obedience to its controlling law. Let but the organic law fail of its demands in any particular, and the whole system suffers from the derangement—sickness and death will be the inevitable consequences. The planet as it wheels its majestic rounds in the infinitude of space, and ever rejoices in its unfettered freedom, finds this very enjoyment in the most unvarying obeisance to the glowing centre of its motion. Sundered from its lawful and necessary relation to this, all is confusion, all disharmony, all wild unmeaning bondage. In every department of created existence does this principle hold, that authority is indispensable to freedom to the extent to which, in its several departments, it may be capable.

Deliverance then from this bondage of a blind self-will and restoration to the attitude of obedience to the organic law of our nature, is the first step towards human freedom. And this precisely is the course which we find the stream of history to have taken, as it flowed in the beginning from its living source, our Saviour Jesus Christ. Prior to his advent, the whole order of the world was preparative—all tended to make man sensible of his helplessness and bondage, and prepare his stubborn spirit for the introduction of that divine principle of life, which was to constitute the positive element of all future history. When then this divine leaven was incorporated in the lump of humanity, its first out-goings were in the direction of emancipation from the slavery of self, and restoration to obedience to the will of God, as this was embodied in the law of this redeemed humanity of Christ. This tendency was not, however, confined to the institutions of religion, strictly so called. It extended itself abroad also into the department of government. This was inevitable. For if Christianity would authenticate its claim as the world-religion, it must penetrate as deep and reach as far as the ruin from which it would deliv-

er man. Not that the state must be subject to the outward domination of the Church, but that inasmuch as the life of true history is none other than our nature raised to its true relations to its author, in proportion as this would leaven the whole mass of the human world, must it enter as the controlling element into every department of its life. Government consequently gave evidence of the regenerating power of the Christian life in the course of a few centuries after its revelation in the world, and ever since has its development exhibited the presence of this new principle.

The first settled tendency then, after Christianity attained a proper consciousness of its contents and mission, was in the direction of discipline. And accordingly did the institutions of both Church and State take their shape. In the department of government, the form was that of monarchy. Nor was this a fortuitous occurrence. Human nature was at this period in its infancy, and as a consequence, incapable of self-government. Just as in the case of the child. If left without the restraints of the family and the school, his growth would be in the direction of self-will, and insubordination to all authority, whether human or divine, and would never reach the ability of self-government. It is only as the perverse tendency of his nature is held under constraint, and self reduced to the attitude of submission to higher authority and law, that he will ultimately be prepared, as he passes the limits of his minority, for the enjoyment of this prerogative. So too as regards the State. What the family and the school are to the individual during his minority, government is to humanity as a general life, during the like period of childhood.

It was about the period of the introduction of modern civilization, when the old Roman culture gave way before the tide of barbaric life, as it rolled in from the north, that the necessity of this disciplinary tendency of history became most palpably apparent. If the world was not to recede, and the toil of ages be forever lost—if humanity was not to be lost to the last sense of responsibility, and given over to the unending conflicts of individual and selfish caprice, it must be brought

under the control of some powerful institute, which could reduce its lawlessness to subjection, and gradually school it in the principles of self-restraint and obedience to authority. This institute we discover in the department of religion to have been the Church ; in that of government, the monarchy. And it was by the co-operation of the two, that ultimately the wild and discordant elements of the world's life were reduced to order and led onward in the direction of true history.

We must not be surprised at the severity and even tyrannical rigor with which the lessons of subordination were inculcated. Learned they must be, at any cost, as the indispensable prerequisites to human liberty. And the miseries of the age are attributable not so much to the spirit of the history of the times, as to the mad and determined opposition of blind lawlessness. The individual must yield to the historic progress of the age, or be crushed beneath its resistless power. Hence was it that government assumed an arbitrary character, which made a reaction necessary in after times.

I repeat it, we must not be surprised at the severity and even cruelty with which the governments of the times were characterized. Even in our own times the principle involved, is approved, and in this age and country finds a practical illustration. The laws of our government are imperious in their demands, and insist upon obedience with the severest of sanctions. Life itself is held to be a subordinate interest. And the government of these United States, mild and humane as it is, will not hesitate to assert its majesty and the supremacy of its laws at the expense, if needs be, of millions of treasure, and rivers of human blood. So too in the family ; the child that submits not to the authority therein lodged, lays himself obnoxious to the severest penalty which it is in its province to inflict. The reduction then, of the elements of unbridled lawlessness, as they confronted the institutions of past history, called forth that terrible rigor which the historic page narrates, and it is not saying too much when we declare that milder measures would not have been adequate to the task.

But the lawful design of all government, is to conduct hu-



manity to the enjoyment of that freedom which is God's merciful provision for man—to prepare him at last for self-government. Humanity, as redeemed in Jesus Christ, and which we have already seen to be the life of all true history, is in its very nature *autonomic*, and the design of its progressive workings is to conduct the world to this very estate. All necessary force will be employed to assert its just and righteous claims; nor will it hesitate to surmount opposition at the expense of human life and liberty. But as soon as this is accomplished, then is it the right of the individual to rise superior to the outward restraints of his pupilage, to the extent precisely to which he is prepared for the enjoyment of this liberty. But unfortunately, poor fallible man is the instrument employed for the assertion of the claims of history; and finding himself in the attitude of dominion, the selfish principle still unhappily clinging to his nature, makes him slow to act in obedience to the very laws of which he has been appointed the executor, and accordingly seeks to hold his position of authority even after the design of his elevation has been accomplished. Thus throwing himself in turn, in the way of the history he ministered to promote; and as a necessary consequence, creates the necessity for a reaction, which in its assertion must overwhelm him with revolution and destruction. Such an assertion of the rights of the individual against undue restraint, we witness in the reaction which took place in the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

We have said that obedience to lawful authority is the first element of human freedom. But this is by no means the measure of its full idea. It is but one side of the living fact, and in its isolated character does violence to the rights of individual man. Together with this then, must be a clear perception of the righteousness of the demands of law, and a full and unconstrained consent—a yielding from free choice. The slave may obey his master through fear of punishment, yet is he not free. A citizen may order his steps in obedience to the law of the State—may abstain from theft, from rapine and murder, only through fear of the penalty, but this does not

make him a freeman. He is a slave in the broadest sense of the term, for he finds no room for the exercise of his free choice. He only is free who obeys from a just sense of the righteousness of the demand, and because this demand meets the full approval of his own pleasure.

The individual will has its rights, and these must not be ignored if man would be free. As soon as he is prepared by proper discipline for self-government, it is his privilege to enter upon its enjoyment, and to restrain him in this direction is to make him a slave. Such restraint was exercised, which opened the way for the reaction already alluded to. This movement was at first confined to the religious world, but being in its nature truly historical, it gradually extended itself over into the department of civil life, and here too the rights of the individual are asserting their claim to respect. But unfortunately in both departments of life we have an exemplification of the fact that extremes elicit each other. Instead of seeking to enjoy individual rights in consonance with the claims of objective authority, the growing tendency is to cancel the claims of this last altogether and elevate self-will once more to the position of a rule of action. Remembering as man does, the goadings of oppression to which he was helplessly subjected, he seems to imagine that all objective rule is alike tyrannical, and the tendency, we say, is to cast its claims aside. Like the wayward youth escaping from the restraints of his minority, instead of approving his disciplinary training, even though this may have been severe and even extreme, and recognizing its wholesome precepts as the just rule of subsequent conduct, he rushes over to the opposite extreme, and seeks to escape from all obligation, save only his own willful pleasure. No former oppression, be it never so tyrannical, can justify the rejection of law and authority to the extent that the constitution of our own nature demands.

From the commencement of this counter movement in history, to the present time, the tendency is in the direction of this extreme, which we may call libertinism. Its spirit has acquired new strength as it has progressed, until in the present age it

has assumed the palpable form of bald individualism, or in other words, *radicalism*, whose aim and effort are to bring all institutions subject to individual caprice, and to measure all right and rule by the standard of private opinion. This is attended with its natural concomitant, a spirit of negativism, which, with its fanaticism, ever stands ready to wage war upon every thing besides which yields not to its ridiculous demands. It is in its own nature rash, unthinking and precipitate, and seeks to carry its ends in the midst of confusion and excitement. It substitutes private notions for past experience, and recklessly seeks to repudiate all obligation to past history, as though it were not in fact the very capital which gives it any weight or right indeed to exist. Just as reasonably might the mathematician affect to turn with contempt upon the elementary branches of his science, and seek to repudiate his knowledge of the multiplication table, as something that is weak and puerile, and whose assistance he no longer needs.

It will be impossible at this time, to attempt anything more than a very cursory notice of the indications which are discoverable in the world around us, of this lamentable tendency. The recent revolutionary movements on the continent of Europe, are here fully in point. It must not be supposed that because the reactionary movement set in several centuries since, that all nations are equally prepared for self-government; all are not equally advanced in the march of civilization and enlightenment. And until each one reaches the age of majority, it were wise to content itself in the state of pupillage. I am well aware that at the time these revolutions broke out, they were by many regarded as altogether hopeful—as the harbingers of universal emancipation, and the speedy elevation of man to the eminence of freedom, to which God is gradually conducting him in the process of the world's history. But a careful examination into their true spirit will readily expose their premature and radical character. They were not the outbirth of the true spirit of liberty, else would their overthrow have been vastly more difficult. The very fact that the movement for the most part was only partial—that it commanded

in the several countries in which it showed itself, no more power and energy than were exhibited, proves conclusively that their disciplinary training was not yet complete. And this may be fearlessly affirmed. For if it be true that God is in history, and that it is but the revelation of his will as regards man—if it be true that the design of this history is to reclaim man from the miseries of spiritual bondage and elevate him at last to the capability, as well as to the enjoyment, of self-government, how is it possibly conceivable, that the ultimate affirmation of this design can fail, after all preparatory progress has been completed. Dare we impiously say that God has begun to build, and is not able to finish—that his arm may lead man to the very portals of the temple of liberty, but there grows impotent, and has no power to conduct him in? No verily. Had these nations accomplished their disciplinary training, and been prepared for self-government; so sure as there is truth in history as the work of God's providence, and strength in his right hand, would they have been lead, triumphant over all their enemies to the enjoyment of this Heaven intended portion for man. God was not in this revolutionary movement, hence its failure. Its advocates felt the weight of rigorous discipline, and were captivated by the harmony and beauty of *our* free institutions, and sought to make *our* privileges their own, but they were like the youth in his teens aspiring to the prerogatives of manhood.

How very different was the reformatory movement of the sixteenth century? When the chord of true liberty, in matters of religion, was then struck, it vibrated in the hearts of the great mass of the religious world, and finding themselves waked up to a sense of the lawful rights, for the enjoyment of which they felt themselves prepared, no opposition sufficiently potent could be commanded to repress their uprisings. It was a world historical movement. God was in it, and it overwhelmed all opposition. So also in the American Revolution. There was no self-will, no rebellion against the rights of law and just authority. At first indeed, there was no disposition on the part of the colonies, to sever their allegiance to the mother

country. The effort was to secure redress for grievances, and deliverance from oppression; and could these have been secured, they doubtless would have been content to remain in dutiful allegiance. They asked not exemption from the restraint of law, but deliverance from the abuse of power. And it was not until all their remonstrances had failed, all their protestations of loyalty had been mocked, that they felt constrained to resort to the alternative. Submission to law, not as a matter of coercion, but of free choice, has ever characterized the American people, and this is the ground precisely of their fitness for independence.

Not so the revolutionists of Europe. The true spirit of liberty had no place among them. They quarreled not with the abuse of power, but with law itself, both human and divine. They embodied no religious element, without which, any movement must be unhistorical. They sought room, not for the exercise of free choice in their obedience to law, but rather the elevation of their own self-will to the dignity of a rule of action. Their spirit was altogether negative, destructional; and in their assault upon the existing powers, they aimed at the indiscriminate destruction of true authority, as well as of its abuse. They had, it is true, a vague dream of liberty, and were fired with its love, as they contemplated the happy and peaceful condition of these United States. But they made their observations from a distance, and from an unfavorable position, and wildly imagined that every one was at liberty to consult his pleasure as regards his own conduct.

This state of things found its practical workings in France. Like an avalanche did the popular will overpower the government; and in a very few days from the commencement of the revolution, was the way opened for the full realization of the dream of liberty. But we all know the history of the Republic. Scarcely was it established when the wild spirit of radicalism revealed itself with such formidable demonstrations of power for future evil, that it speedily became apparent to her calmer statesmen, that the alternative was not between a republic and a monarchy, but between a reign of terror, as once

before experienced by that unhappy people, and a well regulated empire. We, as a people, were loud in our denunciations against the conduct of the present Emperor, and the title of traitor was upon every lip ; but history is now unequivocal in its assurance, that it was a master stroke of political wisdom, to save the nation from being deluged with fraternal blood. And certainly if France was not prepared for a popular form of government, much less were the other nations which put forth their simultaneous efforts.

Kossuth too, in his wild and ungrateful career in this country, gave the most palpable evidence of his fanatical spirit, in seeking to make his crude notions of international policy, the rule of universal action ; and no doubt the want of power was the only barrier which restrained him from proposing terms of peace to the whole world.

But we are not without indications of the presence of this extreme tendency in our own country. The facility with which the most visionary schemes gain a hearing and enlist advocates, is not a little significant in this direction. It would seem to require but a bold presumption and a boisterous tongue, to command influence, and measurably at least to further the wildest project. It cannot be said of us as a people, that we are altogether unthinking, but unfortunately we act before thinking ; and not unfrequently, as recent experience has proven, are subjected to the mortification of retracing our headlong steps. Our citizens, it is to be regretted, have recently exhibited an unwonted spirit of fanaticism in this particular direction. Excitement seems to be the order of the day—discontent with that which is old and established, and an insatiable craving after something new and strange. Ours is emphatically an age of progress, but progress under the conduct of individual will and aggrandizement. There is a thirst for adventure and speculation, and a disposition to wander away from old and fixed landmarks. There is also a rapidly growing disposition to divest government of its prerogatives, and invest the popular will with accumulated power. To the extent precisely that these changes are effected, does our gov-

ernment lose its representative character, and approximate a pure democracy. And it were well for us to bear in mind, that an absolute democracy, is an absolute mob. The popular outbreaks of late so frequent; the increase of crime; the wild and unlawful expeditions for territorial aggrandizement, such as those directed against the island of Cuba; the recklessness which is manifested in large measure with reference to our pacific relations to foreign countries; and besides these, the unrighteous tampering with the Heaven ordained institution of capital punishment; the fanatical furor of ultra-abolitionism, warring alike against Church and State, and refusing fellowship with all who will not make the abolition of southern slavery, the first article in both their political and religious creed; then that shameful exhibition of human weakness, made to challenge the attention of the wide world, under the title of "Woman's Rights," whose deluded votaries seem to forget not only that nice sense of delicacy which makes woman the object of our warmest affection, but equally their own tender sex, and the design of God in their creation; as also that wonderful and mad infatuation—"spiritual rappings"—destroying the peace of homes, and crazing the brains of many of its pitiable subjects; and scores of indications besides which might be mentioned, all go conclusively to show the one-sided tendency of the age—the disposition to give the reins to private will and caprice over against the settled principles of past history, and the actual demands of the law of our nature.

In the department of the Church, the indications are no less portentous. Individual opinion seems to be regarded as the tribunal of ultimate appeal, and indeed the actual measure of all revealed truth. No matter what was the judgment of past ages touching the doctrines of Christianity, all must now square with the views and notions which seem to commend themselves to each man for himself. Herein precisely consists the cause of the increasing growth of heresy around us—the denial of the cardinal doctrines of our holy religion, and the reduction of this with all its glories and confounding mysteries to the measure of the finite understanding. It is not necessary to



cite instances in proof of this growing defection from the truth, with all its concomitant results, as revealed in the terrible evil of the sect system. We need but be familiar with the religious prints of the day, to be certified by their admissions and lamentations, their enquiries and conjectures, that this tendency holds to a much more alarming extent than is perhaps generally supposed. Wide spread insubordination to everything like Church authority, gives additional evidence of the correctness of our allegation. So completely is this regarded as a proper subject for private judgment, that when, in many cases at least, this last is found to be in conflict with the fancies of the individual, he never stops to enquire as to the correctness of his position, or even the probabilities against him, but in the spirit of the most lawless radicalism, sets it at defiance, and seeks out a congenial fraternity among the thousand and one conflicting sects with which Christendom is cursed.

But our remarks have already exceeded their intended limits, and it must now suffice to say, in conclusion, that the most unhappy feature in the radical tendency of the age, is, that it seems not yet to have reached its culminating point. Things seem to be growing worse, and if we may judge from the signs of the times, we have just reason to be apprehensive for the future, with reference to both Church and State. The tendency will necessarily run its course—it will strive its utmost against the truthful progress of history, until this last shall have accumulated sufficient force to assert its rights, when, it is to be feared, it will surmount this unnatural and sinful obstruction with the devastating power of a revolution. The ultimate issue, however, *will* be truthful—*will and must* be in accordance with the requirements of a Heaven directed history. But it is seriously to be feared, that the overcoming of this evil, may yet pour forth rivers of blood, and fill the world with sighs and tears.

Chambersburg, Pa.

S. N. C.

ART. II.—THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE  
FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF ITS ACTION.

WHATEVER may be thought of the so-called "Mercersburg" Theory of Historical Development in its specific details, we do not see how the truth of the general idea, which forms its foundation, can be questioned. If it is, one of two positions must of necessity be assumed: First, that Christianity is not a new life brought into the world in the person of Jesus Christ; or secondly, that, though it be such a life, it is not governed in its action by the law of life.

If the first position be assumed, the question arises, what then is Christianity? This question must not be evaded by statements of what Christianity *does*. For it is not enough to be acquainted with it phenomenally; we must also be able to declare what it is *essentially*.\* Its consequences and effects are richly worthy of study in their proper relations, but even to a correct apprehension of their true character and of the manner in which they were produced, a knowledge of its essential nature is absolutely necessary. And besides, we must be able to define this with some certainty, in order to discover

---

\* "The theological position of the present may be considered especially favorable, for a proper appreciation of the truth in the case of the important inquiry here brought into view. It has been but too common heretofore, to proceed on some particular conception of Christianity, as Primitive, Catholic, Protestant, &c.; by which, as a matter of necessity, a single historical stadium, arbitrarily bounded according to the pleasure of the inquirer, has been made to stand for the idea of the whole; thus causing certain phases of the system, its divinity for instance, or its humanity, its doctrinal, or its ethical, or it may be its æsthetic character only, to represent the general life of which each could be said to form but a single side. Now, however, as the result of our historical cultivation itself, we stand on higher ground. We are able to take a comprehensive survey of Christianity as an organic whole, under all the aspects in which it is presented to our view, in its origin, and throughout the whole stream of its development, down to the present time. In this way it is made much more easy than before, to reach the true life-centre of the whole, and to recognize the beating heart from which all has been formed, and that still continues to animate all perpetually in its several parts."—*Prelim. Essay* (translated from the German of Ullman,) to the *Mystical Presence*, pp. 14, 15.

and point out that element, which belongs to it distinctively\* and alone, and thus vindicate its claims to being not only better and purer than all other forms of religion, but also the only and absolutely true religion. Unless this can be done, its character as divine and perfect cannot be maintained, and it sinks into the category of other religious systems, better than them, it may be, in some respects, but differing from them only in degree, not in kind and nature.

We are justified, therefore, in pressing with all earnestness upon those who deny that Christianity is essentially and distinctively a new life, the question: *What then is it?* If the reply be, It is a new and perfect system of doctrine revealed by the Son of God, we answer: It does indeed involve such a system of doctrine, but this does not constitute its essential and distinctive character. Christianity is not *essentially* a system of doctrine. If it were, it might be communicated and received by the mere process of instruction. Its first, and most direct, and principal effects would be intellectual; and its highest end would be attained, when it had won from society and the individual an acknowledgment of its theoretic truth. *Orthodoxy* would then comprise the result of its influence upon the converted, and the sum of its demands upon the unconverted. It might reasonably be expected too, that it would have been revealed, if such were its essential nature, in a more scientific and doctrinally systematic form. But the Scriptures have not such a form. If compared in this respect with mere

\* "When we speak of the distinctive character of Christianity, it implies the idea of something general as well as particular in its constitution. As general it is *religion*, as particular it is the *Christian* religion. But these two conceptions, in this case, are bound inseparably together. We cannot so abstract from Christianity its particular specific character, as to leave the general idea of religion behind. It must exist under the specific form which belongs to it, or it is nothing, a mere abstraction, destitute of all reality. Christianity is not religion in the first place, with something added to it to make it Christianity; but as religion itself, it is, at the same time, in its inmost ground this particular form of religion, exclusively complete in its own nature, and different in all its parts, by the spirit which pervades the whole, from every other religion. As thus individual and general at once, it claims to be the absolute truth itself; not a religion simply, as one among many, but the one, universal, all perfect religion of humanity in its widest sense. Essential and specific here flow together, and cannot be kept asunder."—*Preliminary Essay to the Mystical Presence*, p. 15.

human writings, (treatises on theology or moral philosophy for example,) they will be found inferior. They make no pretensions to any such character. They abound not in formal logical propositions and metaphysical distinctions. They exhibit truth not in an abstract, doctrinal, but in a living, practical way, and make no account of mere theoretic ideas. The history of the Church, too, from the days of the Apostles to the present time, contradicts the theory that the essential nature of Christianity is to be found in its doctrines. That which is essential to it must be permanent, unchangeable, and always harmonious and consistent with itself. But under no other aspect does Christianity appear in history, more fluctuating and unsettled, than when regarded merely as a system of doctrinal truths. Creed is seen conflicting with creed, theological system opposing theological system; and even of those doctrines which distinguish Christianity most broadly from other systems of religion, and which we now consider fundamental articles of faith, some had no visible, well defined existence in the Christian creed, until long after the Apostolic age.

We recur then again to the question, If Christianity be not essentially a new life, what is it? Is it *law*? Does it distinctively and essentially consist in ethical precepts, in its being a new and perfect system of morality? The Scriptures at once furnish the answer: "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight." Under the aspect of law too, as well as under that of doctrine, Christianity loses all characteristic difference between itself and other religions.\* It

---

\* "Viewed either as doctrine or law, the universal difference of Christianity from other religions, whether Pagan or Jewish, is not suffered to appear. As a doctrinal system merely, though it might be more perfect in its kind, it would not differ specifically from the schools of the heathen world; as a law, though with higher and more excellent requisitions, it would still be specifically of one class with Judaism and the religion of Mohammed; an exalted, purified Judaism only, not a new order of religion, with a principle altogether its own. In both cases we should be at a loss to explain, how it could become the ground of a complete regeneration of the human life, the source of a new order of world-history altogether; how it could give birth to characters and forms of thinking, such as we meet with in Paul and John; how, in one word, it could produce the Christian Church with all

differs from them, and from the moral systems of Socrates or Confucius, for example, not in nature but in degree only, and there is a possibility of improving them, or other systems into Christianity, by a process of suppression, revision and addition. Our Saviour stands in the same general class with human philosophers and philanthropists,—above them in some respects, as the promulgator of a purer morality, of precepts which commend themselves more strongly to human consciousness, but still on no inaccessible height. There is indeed, regarding Christianity under this light, a natural possibility not only of his being reached, but excelled by some future law-giver. The same remarks will apply to the theory which makes Christianity to consist essentially in doctrine. Our Saviour would stand in the same general class with Moses and the Jewish Prophets, and His own Apostles. Nor will it do to attempt to evade the force of this argument by referring to His divine character; for we are speaking, it must be remembered, not of the constitution of His person, but of what constitutes the essential and elemental substance and ground principle of Christianity, and the distinctive difference between it and all other religious and moral systems.

Moreover, by regarding Christianity as essentially an ethical system, the true significance and value of the atonement are entirely destroyed. Our salvation then depends on our own actions. We must stand before the bar of God clothed not in the glorious robes of Christ's righteousness, but in the tattered and filthy rags of conformity to the law. We must be justified not by faith alone, but by works. And the declaration is falsified: "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." The principal object, too, of our Saviour's mission must then have been to perfect the Jewish law by depriving it of its particular character as formed for a single nation, and adapting it to the wants of the world. But

---

that it includes, not simply in the form of thought and precept, but in the way also of actual power and effect."—*Preliminary Essay to the Mystical Presence*, p. 24.

no such idea of Christianity can be entertained, by any one who really understands what is comprehended in the declaration: "By grace are ye saved through faith." To all who, having been "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," in foretaste and hope, would yet go back to the slavery of this legalistic, Judaistic\* view of Christianity, we may well apply the words of Paul: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, \* \* before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" &c. The end which Christianity has in view is one which no ethical system can possibly accomplish. The change it seeks to produce, is far broader and deeper than any change of moral principles and conduct, however complete and thorough.

The question thus again comes up for solution: *What is Christianity?* Does it essentially consist in *feeling*? It cannot. For under this view, also, it would possess no exclusive specific character, no distinctive difference between itself and other religions. Besides, feeling, though more internal, and more deeply connected with our whole nature than either doctrine or law, is altogether subjective, and can have no existence whatever apart from the individual subject. If feeling, then, were its ultimate, essential element, Christianity would possess no reality apart from the individual Christian, no actual objec-

---

\* "Christianity is also *Moral Law*. If, however, it were law only, or law essentially even, it would not have transcended the order of the Jewish religion; it would have been at best a reformed, generalized Judaism only, bringing with it no freedom or life, but leaving men still under the curse of sin and guilt. Law, however refined, always remains law, something over against a man, an outward *shall*, whose nature it is to exact, accuse, condemn, and kill. Spirit only and love can animate, and both can spring only from personal life. By the all prevailing principle of love the law was fulfilled in Christ's life; and now with the communication of Christ's spirit, the spirit and power of the same active obedience are received at the same time. Thus the law comes to be written in the heart, and loses its character of mere outward authority in that of a spontaneous impulse belonging to the inmost life of its subject. Christianity has by fulfilling it taken it out of the way."—*Preliminary Essay to the Mystical Presence*, p. 41.

tive truth, no existence in and of itself. Its truth would be merely relative; its existence and character would be dependent on the individual subject; it would have its seat in, and in a great measure be the product of his natural life, which being essentially corrupt and sinful, can neither produce nor maintain any pure and holy feeling. Moreover, such feeling presupposes, and is based upon knowledge. For we cannot intelligently possess right feelings towards God, unless we know that He exists, and what His attributes and character are. Regarding Christianity as consisting essentially in feeling, we are, consequently, compelled to fall back upon doctrine as forming its ultimate ground, the fallacy of which position we have already shown.

The question then remains still to be answered: *What is Christianity?* What other replies might be given to this question we will not stop to inquire; for they would all necessarily resolve themselves into one or the other of those\* which we have already noticed. And if we have succeeded in showing their fallacy, we have also thus proved negatively that

\* "As might be expected, these different views of Christianity appear in close relation with the various forms in which the *idea of religion* itself has been held; for as it is taken to be the absolute truth of all religion, it must of course participate in its essential character, whatever this may be supposed to be. Viewed as doctrine accordingly, it finds its support in the conception of religion as a mode of knowing God, its prevailing definition, especially among the orthodox, in the period preceding Kant. Its next character, that of law, corresponds with the theory by which, in conformity with the philosophy of Kant, all religion was resolved into a mere postulate of morality. In its evangelical form, as the power of a divine redemption, it rests on the idea of religion as a state of feeling or immediate consciousness. But the relation of man to God in religion does not spring either from his understanding, or will, or feeling separately considered. It includes all at once in the totality of his personal life. On this view, therefore, is based lastly that apprehension of Christianity which makes it to be the union of God with humanity, and under this form only the source of all light and holiness and salvation."

"The first three views which have been described have severally their measure of truth; but the full truth requires their comprehension, in a living way, under the last. Hence, also, this last to be genuine and right, must incorporate in itself the other less perfect conceptions. Christianity can be properly regarded as the union of God and humanity, only where due account is made at the same time of its doctrinal, ethical, and soteriological character, and all is made to rest on its original, inalienable nature, according to which it is no matter of thought or logic merely in any form, but action, history, and life."

\* \* \* \* "That which forms the specific, distinctive character of Christi-



Christianity is essentially a new life. The positive proof of this, it is not our purpose to attempt to exhibit systematically. This has already been done, in other numbers of this Review, by abler pens than ours, as well as discussed in all its relations, and with great clearness and vigor, by Drs. Nevin and Schaff, in treatises familiar to the majority of our readers.\* We will confine ourselves, therefore, to merely throwing out a few thoughts in defence and illustration of the proposition, and then pass on to the consideration of the second part of our proposed subject.

As LIFE, Christianity involves all that is claimed for it, by the theories to which we have alluded. It comprehends the elements of doctrine, law, and feeling, but is wider and deeper than them all. In the process of unfolding itself, it pervades and thoroughly transfuses our whole nature, and by its

---

anity, is not its doctrine nor its morality; nor even its power of redemption; but the peculiar constitution and religious significance of its Founder, as uniting divinity and humanity, truly and perfectly, in his person. Doctrine, law, and redemption rest on this as their basis."

"As doctrine, Christianity addresses itself to the understanding of man, as law to his will; in both cases, as something outward and mechanical, rather than as having power to produce a living piety. In the character of redemption, it reaches to the heart and unfolds in a much higher degree its true life-giving, dynamic nature; but viewed only in this light, it is still but imperfectly apprehended, as an inward state or mere matter of feeling. Its complete sense and full objective value are reached, only when all is referred to the person of Christ, in which God appears united with humanity, and which by its very constitution accordingly carries in it a reconciling, redeeming, quickening and enlightening efficacy. Thus apprehended, Christianity is in the fullest sense, organic in its nature. It reveals itself as a peculiar order of life in Christ, and from him as a personal centre it reaches forth towards man as a whole, in the way of true historical self-evolution, seeking to form the entire race into a glorious kingdom of God. From this centre all takes its full significance; doctrine becomes power; law is turned into life; redemption and reconciliation find a solid objective basis on which to rest. The natural and the human, sanctified by union with the divine in Christ, are sanctified also for all who partake of His spirit and life. Christianity thus neither deifies the natural as such, nor yet opposes it as evil; but purifies and transfigures it, and restores it to its true divine destination."—*Preliminary Essay to the Mystical Presence*, pp. 18, 19, 43, 44.

This Essay, written by Dr. C. Ullman, Professor in Heidelberg University, and translated from the German by the Rev. Dr. Nevin, is well worthy of study, as a masterly, though very compact discussion of "*the distinctive character of Christianity*."

\* As possibly some of the present readers of the Review may not be acquainted with the works referred to above, we annex the titles, hoping that

operation upon and through the intellect, will, and affections, it exhibits itself under the forms of doctrinal views, ethical principles and holy feelings. Under the aspect of a *life* too, Christianity is seen to possess an element exclusively peculiar to itself, one which forms a specific and characteristic difference between it and all other religions. It is not merely *a* religion but *the* only religion, perfect and absolute. Christ ranks not with Confucius and Mohammed, with Moses and Isaiah and Paul, distinguished among them only as the revealer and promulgator of a more excellent doctrine, the giver of a more perfect law, the advocate of purer and more holy feelings, and *thus* the object of higher regard. He stands entirely above and beyond them as the source of a new life, the head of a new humanity, the bestower of a new nature, the founder of a new order of things, the author of a new creation.

It is only as a life that Christianity is consistent with itself in history. As doctrine, as law, as feeling, or anything else than life, it appears often self-contradictory. But when regarded as a new life, brought into the world in the person of Jesus Christ, flowing forth from him, and seeking through the agency of the Holy Spirit, to incorporate itself into the world, and to transfuse it with its power, its true identity appears. Under the most various circumstances, in every age and nation, it is seen to be still the same, ever homogeneous, and consistent with itself, as an individual is the same through all the changes of his life.

Under no other view than that of a life, can Christianity attain its own end, unless the depravity of man be denied.

---

they will obtain them, and receive from their study as much pleasure and profit as it has afforded the writer:

"*The Principle of Protestantism as related to the present state of the Church.*" By Philip Schaff, D. D. Chambersburg, 1845. pp. 215.

"*What is Church History? A Vindication of the idea of Historical Development.*" By Philip Schaff, D. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott & Co., 1846. pp. 128.

"*The Mystical Presence. A Vindication of the Calvinistic or the Reformed doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.*" By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott & Co, 1846. pp. 256.

"*Antichrist: Or the Spirit of Sect and Schism.*" By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. New York: John S. Taylor, 151 Nassau Street, 1848. pp. 90.

Through the disobedience of Adam sin entered as a constituent element into his life, and through it extended its influence over his whole nature. As the head of the human race, he comprised in himself all humanity, which necessarily therefore became corrupt in him; and consequently all, who participate in that humanity, participate in its corruption. We inherit Adam's nature, *because we inherit his life*. It is life that forms the bond of our union, the essence of our relation to him. His life lives in us as his children, transmits to us his nature, and moulds us after his likeness, not only as regards body but also spirit. If, therefore, we do receive from him a corrupt nature, it must be because we receive from him a corrupt *life*. And as every individual by birth receives Adam's life, and through his life his nature, the Westminster Catechism rightly declares, that "we sinned *in Adam* and fell *with him*."

No partial change, it is evident, could relieve man from this situation. No mere enlightening of the understanding, or new revelation of truth; no inculcation of ethical precepts, or promulgation of a new law; no change of feeling, however great, could in themselves avail anything. Nor, in fact, could these changes be thoroughly effected in man, without a corresponding change being first wrought in his nature. For the feelings, the will, and the intellect are, in their character and action, dependent upon and intimately connected with the nature of man; or rather, they are but different sides or functions of that nature, and therefore altogether determined by it in the respects just mentioned. The change, therefore, which is required in man is one which, starting from the inmost depths of his being, must subject his entire personality wholly to its power, and thus be co-extensive with sin itself. It is our life which is the fundamental principle of our nature; and from which, through the operation of its own free inherent action, and according to its own normal law, our nature is unfolded. It is this, which, externalizing itself in individual forms, gives to them their nature and determines them from the cradle to the grave. It is life which forms the channel of communication and bond of union between Adam and his descendants. We

receive his corrupt nature in and through the reception of his life.

The renewing of human nature must begin, therefore, with its *life*. As in Adam, their head and source, the waters of human life became polluted, and carrying with them that pollution, imparted it to all his children, so it is necessary for the work of regeneration, that a new life should flow forth from an unpolluted fountain, which, pouring itself into sinful humanity, should cleanse it from the taints of evil, and restore it to its original purity.

To accomplish this end the Saviour came from heaven. He constituted himself the head of a new humanity, as Adam was of the old. He assumed into union with His divinity our fallen nature, in all respects as it was in Adam, sin excepted;\* and

---

\* Heb. 4: 15, also 2: 14—18.—We have referred to these passages as warranting the view we have expressed above—though, like all other great truths of Christianity, it rests not so much on particular texts of Scripture as upon its general tenor and spirit. A consideration of these passages as well as of the difficulties in which their position involves them, in regard both to the imputation of Adam's sin and of Christ's righteousness, is highly necessary on the part of those, who, to save the sinlessness of the Saviour's nature, (a point we hold as strongly as they and which is in no way inconsistent with the idea that Jesus assumed fallen humanity,) maintain that he took upon himself our nature as it was *before* the fall. What end could be gained by such an incarnation? How could he restore that which had never fallen? And what benefit could we receive from any righteousness or dignity, which our Saviour bestowed on human nature as it existed before the fall. We now stand in no relation to it. It is not *that* nature that we inherit; and any gift that might be bestowed upon it, or any elevation it might receive, could not inure to our advantage.

We do not see how any one can read the passages of Scripture referred to, bearing in mind the context and the scope of the inspired writer's argument, without feeling that they teach that the Saviour assumed *fallen* humanity in all respects as it is in us, sin excepted. How otherwise could the assumption of human nature be the ground for exercising confidence in Jesus, as the writer makes it to be. The assumption of our nature by him as it was before the fall, would never lead us to "come *boldly* unto the throne of grace," but rather to fear that we would *not* "obtain mercy," nor "find grace to help in time of need." How could a being possessed humanly of the vigor and power of our nature as first created have personal experience, (for that evidently is the Apostle's meaning,) of our weakness and infirmity as fallen creatures? How could he be said, in this sense, to "be touched with a feeling of our infirmities?" Or how could it be truly declared, that he "was in *all points tempted LIKE AS WE ARE*, yet without sin!" We are told (Isaiah 53: 4,) "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." But this cannot be strictly and entirely true, unless he assumed our fallen nature; for the weakness and infirmity of our fallen nature is the source of many of our griefs and sorrows—humanity as it existed before the fall was afflicted with no in-

thus he gave it, not only the sinless character which originally belonged to it, but also a degree of positive righteousness and holiness of which the innocence before the fall was only the shadow and prototype. *This was the object of the incarnation.* Humanity, as comprehended in Christ the second Adam, was cleansed, restored, and elevated. The Saviour's death upon the cross delivered us from the guilt and punishment of sin, but did not in itself purify and renew our nature. This was accomplished by his assuming it into union with his divinity, and in his own person sanctifying it, and enabling it to overcome the power of sin. In him humanity is raised to incorruption, as in our first parents it was made subject to corruption. And thus as we "sinned in Adam and fell with him," so we fulfill all righteousness in Christ and are raised to newness of life

firmities and burdened with no sorrow. It may be asked, by way of opposition, how could our Saviour assume fallen humanity and yet remain without sin, since both the fall and its consequences are the fruit of sin? But it may be asked with the same degree of reason, how could our Saviour suffer death, since death is the fruit of sin? To these questions faith answers in the words of Paul: "*This is a great mystery.*" Let us not try to be wise "above that which is written," but at the same time, let us not prevent ourselves from being wise in "*what is written,*" by halting at difficulties which have their source in the weakness of the natural understanding.

Still stronger is the argument in Heb. 2: 14-18. "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself *LIKEWISE took part of THE SAME*; (surely no one will affirm that Adam's children are partakers of his nature as it was *before the fall*; to do so would be to deny in toto the depravity of man,) "*that through death*" (which was not involved in our original nature, but belongs to it only as fallen) "he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver those who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage." "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels," (as well might he have done so, so far as standing in any real connection with humanity as now constituted goes, as to have assumed the nature of Adam before the fall) "*but he took on him the seed of Abraham.*" (It surely will not be said that Abraham and his descendants possessed our nature as originally created.) "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people: For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." The suffering that is here referred to, it is evident from the passage itself, is not that which the Saviour endured on the cross, but that which he endured in temptation, and through the weakness of the fallen nature which he voluntarily assumed; and so the ability spoken of is not his absolute power as divine, but his ability and willingness, as one who had personal experience of similar infirmities and sorrows, to sympathize with us and help us. "*Therefore let us come boldly unto the throne of grace.*"

It is hardly necessary for us, we trust, to say that we fully believe that our

with him. Christ has become the head of a new purified humanity, as Adam was of a sinful one. And as, by inheriting Adam's life in the process of natural generation, we are born into a corrupt nature, so by receiving the life of Christ in the process of spiritual re-generation we are re-born, into a holy nature. And thus to become Christian is not to have a change wrought merely *upon* us, but *in* us, and regeneration is really, and in fact, to "be born again," not the mere giving a new direction and character to our present natural life, but the actual reception of a new life.

This view the Scriptures clearly teach. Their language can be made to harmonize with none other, without violence. But in connection with the idea, that Christianity is *essentially* a LIFE, their declarations stand forth to the apprehension, clear and

---

Saviour was "without sin, holy, harmless, and undefiled," and no inference can be deduced, as we think, by any fair reasoning, from the view expressed above, inconsistent with that belief.

After writing the foregoing, it occurred to us to ascertain what Calvin might say on the passages just referred to, and accordingly taking down his commentary, we found with no little pleasure a full corroboration of our interpretation. He says on Heb. 2: 14: (We give a free rendering of extracts from the Latin, and for the faithfulness of our translation we are willing to be held to a strict accountability,) "This is the conclusion of the foregoing, and at the same time a fuller statement of the cause, than had been briefly given before, why it was necessary for the Son of God to participate in the *same* nature *with us*, and by enduring death, deliver us from it. The passage is worthy of close attention, because the Apostle *not only* asserts the actual humanity of Christ, but *also* because he shows the result which thence flows down to us. *The Son of God was made man*, he says, *that he might be a participant of the VERY SAME condition and nature with us*. On verse 16, Calvin says: "The Apostle wishes to find in the person of the Son of God a brother on account of *his mutual possession with us of a common nature*. Wherefore he is not satisfied to call him a man, but says that he was descended from human seed, and expressly names the *seed of Abraham*." (Calvin could never have used such language had he not believed that the Saviour assumed our fallen nature. Mankind now cannot be said, except by the most extreme Pelagian, to be possessed of the "very same condition and nature" which Adam possessed before the fall. Neither could our Saviour's assumption of Adam's unfallen nature be any ground for regarding the Saviour as "*our brother*," in the sense in which Calvin uses the term. Moreover, our Saviour is not said to have taken Adam's nature, but that of *Abraham* is expressly named; and Abraham surely did not possess human nature as it existed before the fall.)

On verse 17, Calvin says: "In regard to the human nature of Christ, two things are to be considered: the essence of the flesh, and its affections and passions. Wherefore the Apostle says, that he not only put on the *very fleshly nature* of man, ("*carnem hominis ipsam*"—terms which could never be applied to humanity as it existed before the fall,) "but also all the affections and passions which are peculiar to men. \* \* \* Moreover, the Apostle teaches,

unambiguous, requiring no tortuous or far-fetched explanations to exhibit their meaning: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." "In him was LIFE, and the *Life* was the light of men." "For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father and was manifested unto us." "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." "This is the record, that God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life." "The bread of God is he that cometh down from heaven, and giveth *life* unto the world. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world. I am that bread of life." "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." "Because I live ye shall live also." "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." "These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have *life* through his name. For if there had been a law given, which *could have given* LIFE, verily righteousness should have been by the law." "But *thus* was manifested the love of God, that God sent His only be-

---

that Christ was subject to human sufferings, in order that 'he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest,' which words I interpret, that he might be merciful and *therefore* faithful. For compassion is especially required in a Priest, whose office it is to appease the anger of God, to comfort the miserable, and raise up the fallen." \* \* \* "Therefore, however often any kind of evils whatsoever distress us, let it be a consolation that nothing befalls us which the Son of God did not experience in himself, so that he is able to sympathize with us." (How could this be true, if the Saviour assumed humanity as it was before the fall, without weakness or infirmity, but full of the joyous vigor in which it was first created?) \* \* \* "Being about to expiate our sins, he put on our nature that he might have the price of the reconciliation *IN OUR flesh*, and in fine, that by the RIGHT OF A COMMON NATURE, he might introduce us into the sanctuary of God."

Would Calvin have written in this style, had he believed that Christ assumed, not our fallen nature, but that nature as it was originally in Adam? And what becomes of the charge against Rev. Dr. Nevins of being the author of a *new* heresy, for believing that the Saviour assumed fallen humanity, "yet without sin." If guilty of heresy he has at least one of the "Fathers of the Reformation" to keep him company. How many more of them, as well as of other "Fathers," we know not. See also Ursinus' Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, Williard's translation, p. 85; as well as the Catechism itself, answer to the 16th question.



gotten Son into the world, that we might *LIVE through Him* ; as it is written, the just shall *LIVE by faith*. For the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

So, in full accordance with the foregoing, our existence in a sinful state is characterized in the Scripture as death ; not merely because of the eternal punishment which will be inflicted in the future world upon transgressors, but also *because the principle of sin is the principle of DEATH*. Sin opposes constantly the true life in which originally we were created, is antagonistic to it in all its relations and tendencies, and finally prevents it from realizing its proper end. It finds its own natural and legitimate consummation in the entire negation and destruction of all that is truly in our life as it came from God. Thus the principle of sin is really and in fact the principle of *death*, causes us even in this world to be wholly subject to the process of death, and literally fulfills the declaration of Scripture, that now, while on earth, *we are* (not hereafter shall be) "dead in trespasses and sins."

So the believer is represented as raised from death, by regeneration, and gifted with a new *life*, as actually and fully so as in a state of sin he is subject to death : "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound, that as sin hath reigned unto death, *even so* might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." "That like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but *alive* unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." "Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are *alive* from the dead." "For the law of the Spirit of *life* in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of *sin and death*." "For to be carnally minded is *death*, but to be spiritually minded is *LIFE and peace*." "I am crucified with Christ : nevertheless I live ; yet not *I* but CHRIST LIVETH in me : and the *life* which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."

The change which is produced in the believer is called in

Scripture "being born again." Natural birth consists in the reception by an individual of the life of that sinful humanity, which Adam, as the head of the human race, embodied within himself; so spiritual birth is the actual reception by the believer, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, of the life of that sinless nature which Christ, the second Adam, the head of a new, regenerated and sanctified humanity, embodies in himself. Man is the agent in producing this birth in the one case; in the other the Holy Spirit.\* For "as many as received him, to them gave he power to become" (or as the same word is translated immediately below) *be made* "the sons of God, who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, but that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Thus, not merely in reference to the resurrection, (which indeed in Scripture is always spoken of as connected with, and being the final triumph and fruit of our spiritual life,) but also to the whole process of our salvation, is it true, "that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be *made ALIVE*."†

\* There is no ground for the charge which has been brought against this view of regeneration, that it virtually ignores the existence and excludes the agency of the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, the existence and action of the whole blessed Trinity is recognized by it. The love of the Father is the moving cause; the life of Christ, the "Word made flesh," the active element or principle, and the power of the Holy Ghost, the agency by which the work is wrought. But in the view which is thrust forward as a substitute, namely, that the new life which the believer receives, is the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity, our Saviour is excluded from all participation in this part of the work of salvation.

It must be borne in mind too, that only through the medium of Christ, and that too of his humanity as lifted up and sanctified by its union in his person with his divinity, can we be brought into actual communion with either God the Father, or God the Holy Ghost. Any view which makes us to receive the Holy Spirit, except through the medium of the "Word made flesh," is pantheistic.

† The word "all," here, is not to be understood in a distributive but collective sense, meaning not every individual, but the whole, the general totality, not the universal sum of mankind. The new humanity which exists in Christ Jesus, as its head, comprehends mankind in a general, not in a universal way. It comprises potentially only, every individual of the human race, but not so in actual fact. Very many exclude themselves by their unbelief, from being ever comprehended in the new creation in Christ Jesus, and thus *not* being in Him are *never* made alive by Him.

"For the first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a *quickening* Spirit."

This life, like natural life, is given to us at first, not in full vigor and maturity, but in the form rather of a living principle, which develops itself by a gradual process. This process of growth must continue throughout our whole existence on earth. It is constantly opposed by our own natural sinfulness and the evil influences of the world. And as, consequently, we can possess this new life in its fulness and perfection only after death, it is sometimes spoken of in the Scriptures as being given to us in the spiritual world, and as the "promise of eternal life."

It may be thought by some, that we are discussing an admitted truth, so prominently does the doctrine, that Christianity consists essentially in the reception of the life of Christ, as the head of a new humanity, by the believer, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, seem to stand forth in the creed of all who claim to be orthodox Christians. But it will be found, not unfrequently, if a fuller statement of the doctrine be required, that the community of life with Jesus is resolved into a mere community of feelings, views, and principles, a reception, not actually of the *life* of Christ, but only of his doctrines and precepts. In opposition to this, we contend that Christianity is really and in fact, a new life incorporated into humanity in the person of Christ; and from him, as its head and source, it flows down into those who believe, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, causing them thus to be "*born again*," "*re-generated*," "*re-created*" in Christ Jesus. "*Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new.*"

\* \* \* "Many who count themselves orthodox, it is to be feared, come short of the truth here altogether. They get not beyond the old Ebionetic stand-point; but see in Christianity always an advance only on the grace of the Jewish dispensation, under the same form, and not a new order of grace entirely. Greater light, enlarged opportunities, more constraining motives, a new supply of supernatural aids and provisions; these are taken to be the peculiar distinction of the New

Covenant, and constitute its supposed superiority over the Old. But is not this to resolve the Christian salvation into a merely moral institute or discipline? If the whole evangelical apparatus—including Christ's priestly work, the atonement, his intercession in heaven, and the gracious influences of his Spirit—be regarded as an outward *apparatus* simply, through the force of which, as lying beyond himself, the sinner is to be formed to righteousness, the case is only parallel at best with the theory, that turns the work of redemption into a mere doctrine or example. We should have at most, in this view, an exaltation only of the religion of the Jew. Christ would be to us of the same order with Moses; immeasurably greater, of course; but still a prophet only in the same sense."

"In opposition to all this, we say of Christianity that it is a **LIFE**. Not a rule or mode of life, simply; not something that in its own nature requires to be reduced to practice; for that is the character of all morality. But life in its very nature and constitution, and as such, the actual substance of truth itself. This is its grand distinction. Here it is broadly separated from all other forms of religion, that have ever claimed, or ever can claim, the attention of the world. 'The law came by Moses, but **GRACE** and **TRUTH** by Jesus Christ.' " \* \*

\* \* \* \* "Christianity then is a Life, not only as revealed at first in Christ, but as continued also in the Church. It flows over from Christ to his people, always in this form. They do not simply bear his name, and acknowledge his doctrine. They are so united with him as to have part in the substance of his life itself. Their conversion is a new *birth*; 'not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' (John 1: 12, 13.) 'That which is born of the flesh, is flesh.' As such, it can never rise above its own nature. No cultivation, no outward aid, no simply moral appliances, can ever lift it into a higher sphere. This requires a new *life*. 'That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit;' all else necessarily comes short of the distinction. All else, accordingly, is something lower than Christianity. John 3: 1-8."\*

\* "The Mystical Presence." pp. 213, 214, 218.

Without further argument, we assume the proposition that Christianity is Life, and pass on to the question: *By what law is its activity governed?* The obvious answer is: By the *Law of its own nature,—the Law of LIFE.*

That this is the case, we may infer from the analogy of all God's operations in the universe. If we consider His works, we will find in them harmony, not only of results, but also of modes of action. The principles which govern the different spheres of his creation, are few and general. He has to exhibit his wisdom rather by the simplicity than by the complexity of his arrangements. The same disposition of powers is at once the source of harmony and variety. Thus the planets wheeling at unequal distances and with varying motion round the sun, the satellites which attend their course and wheel round them in turn, and the comets which sweep past us with almost inconceivable velocity in their flight to or from the centre of our system, and are lost to sight, for centuries it may be, in unknown realms of space, all obey the same general law. Their orbits and velocities, various as they are, are all the result of but two counteracting forces. So too the law, which guides and determines the oak, from the time when it first bursts its acorn-prison, until, centuries after, it stands with giant dimensions spreading its branches; for the shadow of its boughs is generically the same with that which controls the growth of the violet or the rose. The analogy of nature, therefore, leads us to believe, that if religion *be life*, it is governed by the Law of life.

This, of course, does not imply that there will be no difference between the law of the old and of the new life. On the contrary, the analogy of nature teaches us this also. The lion and the lamb are subject to the same general law of life, and yet it assumes in each a specific difference of the most marked character, making them entirely different in physical conformation, in instinctive feeling and in habits of life. This principle is still more strikingly exhibited in the difference which exists between animal and vegetable existence. The general law of life operates in both these spheres, yet so specifically

modified in each as to make them, notwithstanding their apparently close approximation in some instances, to be entirely and most widely distinct. The analogy of nature, then, teaches us: *That Christianity, being essentially a new Life, must be governed in its action by the Law of Life, specifically modified in accordance with its own specific nature.* This results from the necessity of the case. If Christianity be *Life*, it must be governed by the *Law of Life*. If it is not governed by the Law of Life, it cannot be *Life*.

The truth of this will become more obvious by contemplating Life as it exists in any of the spheres of nature. It is always found inseparably connected, and identical in character with the Law, which it obeys. If its Law be changed, its own nature must undergo a corresponding change. Any other position is self contradictory. Imagine, for instance, that the Life of vegetable, were made subject to the Law of animal existence, in that case, it would remain no longer vegetable life, but become animal, and the individual forms which were subject to its action, would not be vegetables, but animals. Or, suppose, that the life which animates the lion, were made subject to the law which controls the life of the lamb, the lion would necessarily lose his proper life and nature, and assume the life and nature of a sheep. Or, to put the case in another form, suppose that something which had always been regarded as belonging to the vegetable or animal kingdoms, were proved not to be governed by the law of life, under any of its forms, but to be subject solely to the law of chemical affinity, or of cohesive attraction, could it any longer be included in the spheres of vegetable or animal life? And why not? Because the law which controls it determines its character and nature. We cannot believe anything to be alive, which is not subject to the law of life. The law of its life is the very ground of the existence of that which lives. This proposition appears to be self-evident, and one would suppose it would be *universally* admitted, and yet it is gravely controverted by some who assume to be lights in theology!

We are also lead to the conclusion, that Christianity is gov-

erned in its action by the law of life, by a consideration of its effects upon nature, and of the manner in which it produces that effect. Man does not cease to be man, by becoming Christian. In the true meaning of the term, he becomes not less, but more fully man. His human nature is not destroyed, but renewed, restored to its original type, and elevated to a higher sphere, than it of itself could reach. The change wrought by Christianity is, therefore, *super-natural*, as transcending the power and lifting us above the influence of our sinful nature, but not on that account *un-natural*. In one sense, it is most truly and emphatically natural. It violates none of the laws properly belonging to our nature, but fulfills them. It restores to them their original freedom and harmonious, efficient action, and through them, as thus renovated and restored, it carries the believer forward and upward to the end for which he was created. The process by which Christianity acts, therefore, is in full accordance with, and subject to the *original law of our nature*, or, in other words, the *law of life*.

The question now arises : What is this law of life ? We answer, that of GROWTH or "ORGANIC DEVELOPMENT." The signification of these latter terms, as employed in natural science, is well ascertained ; and the idea which the writers of the so-called "Mercersburg School" intend to convey by their use, they have frequently and clearly stated, especially Drs. Nevin and Schaff. Yet as, in some instances, those terms may have been inaccurately employed, and as moreover their true meaning has frequently been grossly misunderstood, and *most* grossly misrepresented, it may not be amiss briefly to dwell upon them.\*

If we contemplate the law of life, as it exhibits itself in the

---

\* While we could easily adduce proof that the meaning of these terms, in some instances, has been wilfully and maliciously misrepresented, we are convinced that, in other cases, they have been misunderstood through ignorance. And where ignorance of their theological force exists, there is probably like ignorance of their signification, as used by writers on Natural Science. It will scarcely be credited, and yet it is the fact, that a Professor in a flourishing Theological Seminary, belonging to one of the largest religious denominations in our country, gravely professed his inability to perceive any essential difference between the law that holds together the particles of a stone, and that which unites the parts of a living body.



natural world, we will find a marked difference between it and other laws of nature. First, we observe a principle at work, which collects and holds together particles of matter, with more or less force, according to circumstances. It produces no change in the nature of those particles, but merely brings them together into local contact. Thus the materials which form a block of granite, continue as fully quartz, feldspar, and mica, as in their separate state. This power is usually called cohesive attraction.

Somewhat higher in the sphere of nature, we discover another and more powerful law: that of chemical affinity. The union produced by this law between particles of matter is more intimate, than that produced by the activity of the other law. The substances, which it amalgamates together, frequently lose their individual peculiarities, and form a compound possessed of qualities which belonged to none of those substances in their separate state. Thus from the union of two gases, each, in its own way, injurious to life, the one a supporter of combustion, the other itself combustible, there results a liquid, not unhealthy but healthful, and neither combustible, nor a supporter of combustion,—water. The process by which the law of chemical affinity, as well as the law of cohesive attraction, acts, is altogether mechanical. The law, in both cases, is merely a blind force acting upon material particles in an altogether outward way, throwing them oft times into definite forms, yet still not really transmuting those particles with its own power, nor working in and through them, as the organs of its own action. It has no power of self-organization. Thus though the law of crystalization arranges the particles which compose the crystal into a well defined symmetrical form, yet its action is altogether outward and mechanical. There is no self-organizing power exhibited in the process. The connection of the material particles is altogether external, depending entirely upon chemical or cohesive attraction, and not upon any organic relation. The parts of the crystal do not become the living media, or organs, through which the law of crystalization exerts itself. They are not found acting themselves as

transfused internally with the law, as well as being acted on. They are separate and each one in itself complete. For, if the crystal be crushed, though its symmetrical form will be destroyed, the fragments will still retain all the qualities which they possessed, when united together as a single crystal. Hence the sphere, which these and similar laws control, is called *in-organic* nature.

But still higher in nature we recognize the existence of another law,—the *Law of Life*. This law acts, not in a merely mechanical way, but changes into accordance with itself the very inmost nature of that which is the subject of its action, and forms it into organs in which, and through which, as well as on which, its power is exerted. It does not merely heap up, or bind together material particles in an outward way into some definite shape, but transfusing them with its own nature and power, it *organizes* them into a living body, in which, and through which, as well as on which, it acts. Hence the sphere which is subject to the operation of this law is called *organic* nature. The relation produced between material particles is not that of mere local contact, or chemical transformation, but that of a *living union*. They are not merely the passive subjects of the law which controls them, but also its active media or organs, through which alone, in fact, the law finds external existence, and possesses actual power. They also themselves modify and control, to some extent, the action of the law to which they are subject; and thus a mutual, reciprocally determining influence, or relation, exists between them and the law, which has organized them. The different parts of the individual forms in which this law actualizes itself, have no importance or meaning in themselves, and are merely isolated independent parts. They properly exist only, and have importance only in their relation to the whole, of which they are the parts, and which, as products of common life, they unite to form. Thus, while each fragment of a crystal, when existing only as a fragment, is as fully pervaded by the law of crystalization as it was when united to a perfect crystal, the organ loses its proper character, and ceases to be subject to the law of organization,

when separated from the whole of which it formed a part. A branch of a tree, or a member of a body, for instance, is deprived of its living, organic nature when sundered from the tree or body to which it belonged. It is no longer an *organ*. The power which organized it, no longer controls and preserves it. It dies, and in time decays, and is dissolved under the operation of *in-organic* law, into the elements from which originally it was formed.

The force of the term "development," may also be easily determined. It is a universal property of life to unfold itself from within, by a self-organizing power, towards a certain end; which end is its own self-realization, or, in other words, the actual exhibition and actualization in outward form of all the elements, functions, powers, and capacities, which potentially it includes. Thus life may be said to be all at its commencement which it can become in the end. The oak of a thousand years is but the external actualization of that which the acorn potentially involved. But though life, by such a process, constantly unfolds and realizes itself, it can never become in actuality anything else than what, at the start, it is in possibility. "Thus, (to use an illustration of Dr. Schaff's,) though the acorn may grow into the oak, it can never become an apple-tree.\* In all true development, we recognize three distinct processes :

---

\* This illustration shows well the groundlessness of the charges sometimes made against this theory of development, that it acknowledges a possibility of change in the essential nature and substance of Christianity, and a possibility also of Christianity advancing beyond itself, and of carrying humanity forward to such a position that Christianity itself shall be left behind. The growth of the acorn involves no substantial and essential change in its nature; it is but the unfolding of that which truly and actually belongs to it. As regards its own proper constitution, the oak is the same, whether young or old, when it exists as the sprouting acorn or the giant tree. It can never advance beyond itself, nor in the process of its growth, ever change its own specific nature into that of some other tree.

So Christianity in its substance and its essential nature, being comprehended in a revelation of Him, who is the absolute truth, "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," is also itself absolutely true, unchangeably the same, and incapable of advance or improvement. In the apprehension by the Church, and through the Church, by the world, of that which it comprehends and reveals, Christianity is alone capable of development. In this sense, however, it does, and must unfold itself constantly more fully to human apprehension (in regard to its doctrinal, ethical, liturgical, and all its other elements,) until finally its outward form, as externally actualized in the world,

first, that of destruction or abolition ; second, that of preservation, and third, that of improvement or elevation. The child is abolished as a child in the young man, and yet is preserved at the same time, and raised into a higher stage of life. The temporary, outward form is abolished ; the substance, the idea is preserved ; not, however, by continuing to be what it was before, but by mounting upwards to a more exalted mode of outward existence." This process by which life unfolds itself, this progress of life towards its own realization, is what is meant by the term "*organic development*."

shall be a complete and perfect exhibition of its essential inward life and nature; and thus the Church shall be perfectly the embodiment and truly the likeness of Him who is its life and Head, and who has appointed it to be "His body." Humanity can never progress beyond Christianity ; for Christianity is the living revelation of Him who is the absolute truth, and therefore, itself absolutely true.

It is with surprise that we have seen the charges, alluded to above, made against Drs. Nevin and Schaff ; for certainly they have carefully guarded themselves on those points, as the following extracts from their writings will show :

"The idea of such a development does not imply, of course, any change in the nature of Christianity itself. It implies just the contrary. It assumes that the system is complete in its own nature from the beginning, and that the whole of it too is comprehended in the life of the Church, at all points of its history. But the contents of this life need to be unfolded; theoretically and practically in the consciousness of the Church. What it includes potentially and in principle or idea, requires to be actualized or made real in humanity, as a new creation in Christ Jesus. All this is something very different from such a "*Fortbildung des Christenthums*," as has been conceded to us by the rationalist Ammon. Christianity can never transcend itself. It can never become absolutely more than it has been from the beginning, in the person of Christ, and in the truth of the Gospel." "It belongs to its very nature, however, that it should not remain in the person of Christ, or the letter of the Gospel, but pass over into the life of the Church. This implies development. In its very constitution, the Church involves a process ; which will be complete only when the "new heavens" shall reflect in full image the "new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." "And still all this will be nothing more than the full evolution of the life that was in Christ from the beginning ; and the full power of which has been always present in the Church, still struggling through all ages toward this last glorious "manifestation of the sons of God." *Introduction by Rev. Dr. Nevin to Dr. Schaff's Prin. of Prot.* p. 20.

"It is true now indeed, that the Rationalists also talk much of an ever-advancing humanity in their sense. But they mean by this, an advance beyond Christ and the Bible. Every such conception we decidedly REJECT ; and affirm, rather that this would be no advance, but a relapse only to Paganism and Judaism. According to our view, on the contrary, Christ is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end ; and all true progress, as we have before remarked, consists simply, in a more full appropriation continually of his divine human life, and a deeper understanding of his word, which is the ABSOLUTE TRUTH and eternal life itself." *Dr. Schaff's Treatise on Historical Development.* p. 108.

That Christianity is life, and as such, must be subject to the law of life, or of organic development, we have already, we think, made sufficiently evident. We are led, irresistibly, to the same conclusion, by the manner in which Christianity exhibits itself, in its influence upon the world, both in the case of individuals and of mankind as a whole. Life, as we have already seen, has two universal and constant characteristics; first, that of a power unfolding itself from within; secondly, that of self-organization. Both of these characteristics, we can unequivocally recognize in the operations of the Christian religion. As a change produced in man, Christianity is not the effect of another force operating upon him, but the result of its own proper activity working itself out, according to the law of its own nature, to its own accomplishment. It appears first as the principle of a new and holy life, which, by degrees unfolding itself, struggles upward towards its own fulfilment. The process by which it thus unfolds itself is *organic*. It exhibits itself in all its operations as a self-organizing power. It infuses itself *into* humanity, controls and modifies all its functions, and, giving it a character harmonious with its own nature, seeks through it, as the medium or organ of its activity, its own self-realization. Christianity is not a power which has its seat outside of humanity and acts only upon it. The change it produces is not merely external, nor is its mode of action mechanical. Like life under other forms, it dwells within its subjects, and works in and through them, as well as on them. As life, in the sphere of vegetation, takes up air, earth, moisture, and other elements, and organizing them according to its own specific nature, unfolds itself in them, and seeks through them to grow up into a plant or tree, its proper end; so Christianity, infused into humanity in the form of a new and holy life, seeks thoroughly to pervade it, fills it with its own vivifying power, (as natural life pervades the body,) and taking up all its elements into itself, it strives to give to them its own pure character, and through them and in them, as its organs, it develops itself towards its ultimate end.

This view is fully sustained by Scripture. The Bible does

not represent Christianity as a change, sudden and at once complete, wrought *upon* the nature of man by a power which remains external to him, but as a progressive change, the result of a divine principle of life implanted *in* him, which unfolding itself in his person, in the end pervades his whole nature ; and which giving to him its own pure and holy character, finally raises him entirely above the condition of sin and death, in which he naturally exists. Thus the kingdom of heaven (in its relation both to the individual Christian and to humanity as a whole,) is likened to a grain of mustard seed, whose life, embodied at first in but a diminutive form, develops itself by a gradual process into a tree. The Church is represented, not as merely an aggregation of individuals, outwardly held together by the tie of a common interest, common views and feelings, but as a living body, formed indeed of individual members, but holding *as* members an organic, living relation to it and to each other, pervaded all by the life of Jesus Christ, and united to Him and to each other by the closest and deepest of all unions, a living union. It is only under this view that we can receive, without resolving them into uncouth and unmeaning figures, the beautiful and striking descriptions which abound in the Apostolic writings, of the Church as embodying the life of Christ, and of Christians, as members of His body. Thus only can the declaration of Paul be fully verified, that "if one member suffer, the other members suffer with it, and if one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." And thus only can it be, that those who believe, *are*, in fact, and not in a fiction of the imagination, "the body of Christ and members in particular." Again, Paul represents the Church as a "building," advancing towards its completion, not, however, by mechanical aggregation, but which, by a living power within itself, "groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord."

It seems to us to be utterly impossible for any one to read the descriptions of the nature of the Christian Religion and Church, which abound in the New Testament, and especially in the writings of Paul and John, and to give himself up unservedly to their teachings, without being forced to the conclu-

sion, that Christianity *is* essentially a new and holy life, incorporated into humanity in the person of Christ Jesus, and that from Him, as its head and source, pouring itself into the world, it seeks there, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, organically to develop itself. Thus striving to transfuse our sinful nature with its own living and life-giving power, it infuses into it more and more of its own holy character, *re-forming, re-newing, regenerating, re-creating* it, until in the end, both humanity as a whole, then co-extensive and identical with the Church, and individual Christians who form its membership, being thoroughly purged from sin, "not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing," but "holy and without blemish," shall be changed from glory unto glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord, and be transformed into the perfect image of Him, who is the type and head of the new creation, our Lord Jesus Christ.

Here it may be well to notice the objection which, perhaps, may have occurred to the minds of some of our readers, that as the law of organic development exists in our sinful nature, and as the object of Christianity is the renewal of that nature, Christianity must be governed in its operation by a different and opposite law. This objection is founded on a mistaken assumption. The law of organic development is not peculiar to our sinful nature. It is found there not *because* sin infused it. On the contrary, it is the original law of humanity, by which humanity was destined to act, before sin entered the world, and through which it would have reached its true end, had sin not entered. According to this law, Adam would have attained in reality that which he possessed in possibility. He was created pure and innocent, yet, not positively, but only negatively righteous; for positive righteousness consists in the actual fulfilment of the law. The possibility in which he was created of becoming positively righteous, would have been developed into the actual exhibition and possession of such positive righteousness, had he obeyed the divine commandment. But by his disobedience, and consequent fall, he prevented this possibility from being ever realized, either in his own person, or in his descendants, by the efforts of humanity alone. Sin,



it is true, did not make him to be anything else than a man by the change it produced. It did not destroy his original nature, as such, nor entirely abolish the law which controlled it; yet still, entering as a new element into him, it perverted and polluted the one, and thwarted and disorganized the action of the other. Thus it gave to his life a different character from what it originally possessed, and rendered it impossible for man to fulfill the object of his creation. Humanity still struggles to develop itself, and to realize its proper objects; but evil, as one of its constituent elements, now infects it with its own character, turns its activities from their proper direction, and carries it irresistibly away from its true end to one that is false. Sin contradicts all the original, holy tendencies of man's nature at every point, and makes his whole existence, and all his exertions to be self-contradictory. His life, as now constituted, ends in death. His efforts to develop the original principle of goodness within him, tend only to the development of evil. Hence it is, that we behold the melancholy spectacle of humanity, in all ages of the world, struggling in vain, in the persons of men of giant minds and earnest spirits, to realize its destined end;—its very exertions to attain to virtue often sinking it deeper in sin; its search after truth involving it more hopelessly in error. Hence it is, that, in all time past, and even now, the mournful cry is heard, from those whose eyes are blinded to the beauties of the new creation in Christ Jesus: "Who will show us any good?" Herein is to be found the true inability of man to reach the end for which he was created, that sin opposes, and renders impossible (without the grace of Jesus Christ,) the development of the possibility which exists within him.

Here, too, is the necessity for the incarnation. It was necessary for the Son of God to embody in himself, as its generic head, a new humanity, in which sin would not exist as an opposing element. It is only in the sinless life, which flows down upon believers from Christ, its head and source, that the law of life, or development, is free from the contradicting element of evil, and possessed of full liberty and ability to unfold

itself within us in the form of righteousness. And in this freedom from self-contradiction consists the power of Christianity to triumph, finally, over all evil. True, sin opposes its development, but not as an inherent element, but as a principle external to it, standing over against it in its antagonism, and which in the end it will utterly destroy.

From this it will be seen also, that the objection, that all development necessarily involves the idea of limitation, or self-destruction, is entirely unfounded. The process of development, in our unrenewed nature, always involves this result, because of its inherent element of evil. But this is not the case with that life which we receive from Christ. No principle of self-contradiction inheres to it and prevents it from reaching its destined end. Christianity, therefore, will experience no decay, have no old age to paralyze its powers, no death to endure. The Saviour, comprehending in his own person the whole new humanity, for it overcame sin and death; and the blessed fruits of his conquest all receive, who receive his life. In Him this new humanity triumphed. Its life, derived from him "who knew no sin," is harmonious with itself, and works out, not like the life of unregenerated humanity, its own destruction, but its own fulfilment. It is true, it still meets with the principle of sin in the world, but, having once in the person of Christ, its head, overcame it, it goes forth to battle with it again and again, in the certainty of success, until after having defeated it under all its protean forms, righteousness shall triumphantly reign, as the principle of life, over all the world, instead of sin, the principle of death. Then shall the Church be purged from all the blemishes and schisms which now impair its unity and mar its beauty. Comprehending then, all humanity actually, as it now does potentially, it shall be indeed the perfect body of Christ, and He shall "present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing." Then there shall indeed be "one body and one Spirit, and we shall have all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,

from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

Every other view of Christianity than that of a living and life-giving power, freely unfolding itself in the world by its own activity, and organizing for itself an outward form from the elements with which it is there surrounded, suitable to its own wants, and to the necessities of each particular age and nation, falsifies the history of the Church. If Christianity is not such a power so acting, then it must be a system fixed, determined and complete externally, as well as internally, in all respects. It must be not only one and identical with itself, but also the *same* unchangeably and in all particulars, in outward aspect, as well as in inward substance, in every period and country. From the start, it must have been fully and completely defined in regard to doctrine, to feeling, to ethical principles and practice, to worship, and to all the various modes in which its activity is exerted. For being divine, it must be perfect, and therefore, unchangeable in every particular essential to its nature. The changes which have taken place in the Christian Church, its government, worship, doctrinal views, and practice, consequently, must all be regarded as mere human changes, produced not at all by the action of the Christian religion, or any movement in the Church, but solely by the fleshly will of man. They must be looked upon, therefore, as altogether corruptions. And taking the Christianity of primitive times as our model of perfection, we must make that of the present age to conform to it outwardly and inwardly, and in every particular.

This is the very essence of Oxford Puseyism. We must, then, despising all that has been since accomplished, leap over the intervening chasm of eighteen centuries, back to the point from which Christianity started, and endeavor to make the Church conform in all respects to the aspect which it then presented.\* This can only be ascertained by tradition, and here

\* It is strange to see the tenacity and infatuation with which this is in-

then we become slaves to tradition in its lowest form. And in attempting to carry out this theory in practice, other serious difficulties meet us. For, first, there is much that was connected with the Christianity of primitive times, that we feel was not essential to it. How to separate that which was essential, from that which was not, becomes a most important question. Here the principle of tradition fails. It serves only to show what the form of the Church then was, but cannot distinguish for us, that which legitimately belonged to it, from that which was foreign to its life.

sisted on, in the very face of historical facts and scriptural declarations. Unceasing changes are rung upon the "perfect purity" of the Church of primitive times, by men who *ought*, and we believe, often *do*, know better. For the veriest tyro in the history of those times, must feel that there is little more reality in their alleged purity, than there is in the golden age of heathen poets. On this very account, it is fashionable now, to meet, with a general howl of disapprobation, any attempt at a fair exhibition of the real condition of the Church in those ages. And for this reason, too, as well as because of their alleged Romanizing tendency, the late articles of Dr. Nevins, on "Early Christianity," created such dislike and fear, and were so fiercely looked at by the religious press. His delineation is too graphic, the facts brought forward are too stubborn in their direct contradiction of those delightful imaginative pictures of "primitive purity," to be at all pleasant. The substantial correctness of that delineation, as regards the historical facts adduced, no one, as yet, has attempted to disprove. In fact, the general objection to it seems to be not its supposed want of truth, so much as its making the truth known. The principles, which governs such a course of procedure, is of a somewhat different order of morality from that which is expressed in the old heathen adage: "Fiat justitia, ruat cælum; whether of a higher order, is somewhat questionable.

Quite surprising, too, is the comfortable unconsciousness of those who assume the position alluded to, that in so doing, they flatly contradict the facts and principles of the Scriptures, and the teachings of the Saviour himself. *He* never spoke of the Church in his own day, nor even in that of His Apostles, much less in the "primitive ages" succeeding, as possessed of perfect purity, and as intended to be a model for all future time. *He* represented Christianity, not as a tree, then in perfect maturity, clothed with verdure, and loaded with fully ripened fruit, which, in after ages, decay should seize, until dropping one rotten bough after another, it should stand with dead and heart-eaten trunk, an exhibition of weakness, and fill those who dwelt beneath its shadow, and sighed for the excellency it possessed in "primitive times," with constant dread, lest it should fall and crush them. *He* did not liken the kingdom of heaven to a mass of already fully leavened meal, which, in its succeeding changes, should lose its healthful and nourishing power, and putrify into a mass of corruption; but to a grain of mustard seed, "which indeed is the least of all seeds, but when it is grown, is the greatest among herbs, and *becometh* a tree," "and shooteth out great branches,"—"to leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal until," in its gradual working, "the whole was leavened." Our Saviour's declaration in reference to the purity and perfection of His Church, referred not to the then present,

But besides, no candid mind can study the changes which have taken place in Christianity, without being convinced, that many of the forms, which it assumed in after ages, have quite as strong claims to legitimacy, as those in which it exhibited itself in primitive times. Here then, the principle that Christianity is perfect in outward form, as well as in inward character, proves false, and to save the truth that it is divine, the outward is rejected as not belonging to it, and only the inward

---

or past, but to the future; and so also those of His Apostles. Only after long ages of conflict, of humiliation, and oft times temporary defeat, was the Church purged from the pollution of sin, by the fiery trials through which it passed, and "cleansed with the washing of water by the word," to be presented to "Himself a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but holy and without blemish." Among those even who surrounded the Saviour, when on earth, there are no evidences of perfection. Many of them became "offended at him," and went back into Jewish unbelief. And in the small company of his Apostles, there was a Peter, (true disciple as he was) who denied him with cursing, while the others forsook him in the hour of trial. And after the Holy Ghost had descended upon the disciples, there was not perfection then among even *them*, nor purity, in any especial degree, in the Church. (Acts 5 and 6. Gal. 2: 11-14. Phil. 3: 12-14. Heb. 6: 1. *et alia.*)

We do not see how any one, who reads the New Testament, can speak of the "perfect purity of the primitive Church." We find constant allusion in the Apostolic writings, to errors in doctrine, and wickedness in conduct, even in their time. Heresies, schisms, dissensions, envyings, strifes, and corruptions, of which "it is a shame even to speak," are mentioned and condemned, as prevailing in, and polluting the Christian Church. And in regard to many things, the innocence or criminality of which, seems to be perfectly obvious at this day, the early Christians needed and received, careful and detailed instructions from the Apostles. And how, in fact, *could* the Christianity of those times have been anything else than exceedingly imperfect, unless all the laws which govern human nature and determine human character, had been abrogated. The early Christians had grown up, subject to the most corrupting social influences, and amid the darkness of heathenish superstition, on the one hand, or the self-righteousness and sceptical indifference of a lifeless Judaism, on the other; and unless, therefore, they could have been stripped entirely of their personal characters, the results of previous associations would necessarily cling to them, and their opinions and practices, as Christians, be extremely defective. As long as the Apostles lived, they doubtless were able, in a good degree, to counteract these influences, through the extraordinary weight of their personal characters, and still more through the extraordinary special advantages and authority, which they possessed, as directly commissioned by the Saviour, and as supernaturally inspired with the Holy Ghost. But after their death, the circumstances mentioned, must have wrought with mighty power, in the way of deterioration and corruption, upon "the primitive Church."

Most discouraging, too, is the aspect, which the whole history of Christianity wears, under the light, or rather the darkness of this primitive purity theory. The Church was in a steady process of corruption; the light which was destined to shine with ever increasing brightness, becoming constantly

is acknowledged. Forms then, must be looked upon as of no account, whatever, but as mere human inventions, shackling the free spirit of Christianity. Here the theory ends in self-contradiction, and from a system of spiritualistic formalism, it runs, by a necessary re-action, over into a system of abstract spiritualism, denying the necessity of any forms whatever. Thus these two errors, though opposite extremes, are naturally

more dim; the only ark of safety to the human race, shattered by the storms of nineteen hundred years, and almost engulfed by the waves of superstition and infidelity; those waves rising higher and higher; those storms becoming more violent; those within the ark departing more and more from the "simplicity and purity of primitive faith," and the ark itself sinking deeper amid the billows. The last refuge of humanity—the "rock" on which the Church is built, seeming to become a slippery foundation, less and less secure, from which one portion after another of that Church, losing, successively, its hold, is swept away by the raging floods of error and corruption, until now at last nothing is left in verification of the Saviour's promise, (Math. 16: 18, and 28: 20) except a few broken and scattered fragments, mournful relics of the wreck of a once perfect edifice, scarcely visible amid the deep gloom of superstition, in the dark ages of the past, or the false glare of philosophic rationalism, in the present. For, if resemblance to primitive times, be the standard of knowledge, purity, and perfection, in the Christian Church, then has the Church been constantly becoming less perfect, and more corrupt, until now it is almost impossible to discover a single trace of her pristine excellence. What room is left, in such a theory as this, for the constant presence of the Saviour in his Church? What guarantee that the floods of evil, that have been so long prevailing against it, shall ever be turned back, or shall not finally entirely overwhelm and engulf it? How much longer is this period of deepening gloom and growing corruption to last? And by what process shall these dark clouds be dispelled, and the light of true wisdom again dawn upon us? There is no other dispensation to succeed the Christian. No institution to be established more permanent, or powerful to the overthrow of evil, than the Church. If she has failed, all is lost.

But how encouraging, by way of contrast, to look upon history as a process of constant Christian development. Then the Church, at first feeble and imperfect, is seen, (like the Saviour in his infancy and childhood, Luke 2: 40-52,) to increase in knowledge, and faith, and love, and every Christian grace; her apprehension and exhibition of the rich treasures of truth and mercy, comprehended and revealed in the person of the eternal "Word made flesh," constantly fuller and deeper; the truths of the written word living more clearly in her consciousness; though, like Peter, severely tempted, and sometimes, for a while, seemingly overcome; yet, like him, still repenting, and faithful to the end; though, like Paul, often harrassed and sorely beset, yet, like him, still going forward, in the certain conviction of a glorious future triumph; though, like the ever-blessed Saviour himself, betrayed, and given up to her enemies, by those who eat her bread and drink from her hand; yet, like him, mightier in the hour of weakness than all her foes, and through her humiliation, only rising to a higher state of exaltation. "Confused as may be the present, and dark as may be the future, the past still gives him, who looks upon it in the light of this theory, the assurance that the Omnipotent Head of Zion, will unravel the confusion, and cause the darkness to become light, and bring his most frantic enemies to bow at his feet."

connected together ; and hence the inconsistency of the spiritualistic Quaker, on the one side, who becomes, in fact, the stiffest formalist, and the formal Puseyite, on the other, who begins by making religion to depend on forms, and ends by rejecting all forms, except those of the particular age which he chooses to imitate. Both these errors falsify history, as well as contradict the true idea of Christianity. The Christian religion is necessarily connected with forms, and yet in the beginning, it did not exist in any complete, and perfectly defined forms. In vain do we look for it, as a defined and permanent system, externally complete in its details, in the time of the Apostles, or that immediately succeeding. No defined system of Church government, no defined system of Church doctrine, no defined system in any respect, presents itself in those ages. It exhibits itself first, as a living principle, which taking up into itself the elements, upon which it works, by a gradual process drives out their worldly spirit, infuses into them its own, and thus moulds them into an outward form, consonant to its own nature. Christianity thus *grows* into an outward form, as the principle of life in a tree grows up into the form of trunk, branches, leaves, and fruit. It is only under this view, that the seeming contradiction, which Christianity presents in history, as always connected with, and dwelling in, and manifesting itself through forms, and yet, as at the same time, always independent of, and controlling, and changing those forms, can be satisfactorily solved. Christianity cannot be separated from forms in fact, though it may be in thoughts; for apart from them, it has no reality, and yet forms in themselves, have no importance whatever. They possess importance only so far as they are the *legitimate and necessary expression* of the life of Christianity. So the principle of human life can only acquire a real existence by unfolding itself into individual forms, and yet those forms, in themselves, do not constitute human beings, but the moment life ceases to animate them, become mere dead masses of matter.

Again, it is only as a *LIFE*, thus organically developing itself, that Christianity can be regarded as consistent and identical with itself in every age, and nation, and in all its



various changes, in regard to doctrine, practice, government, worship, and in other respects. It is one, and identical, not as a fixed and permanently defined system, standing without alteration in the world, but one, in all its various aspects and external modifications, as the life of an individual is one through all the changes of infancy, youth, and manhood. So too, only under the same view, can we account for the errors and corruptions into which the Church has constantly fallen, and the one-sided aspect which Christianity presents, as exhibited by each particular age or nation. It is vain to say, that these are merely human, and have no actual connection with Christianity. All history, with consenting voice, testifies the contrary. The imperfections and corruptions of the Church, have as natural and close a connection with the life of the Church, as the bodily diseases of an individual have with his bodily life. The principle of life in an individual, if surrounded with unhealthy conditions, impure air, unwholesome food, insufficient exercise, &c., takes up these conditions, and endeavors to develop itself by their means. Along with the conditions it receives also their injurious character, and is itself modified injuriously by them. Their injurious influence, however, in the process of development it struggles to overcome and reject, and this struggle constitutes disease. If the physical life of the individual fails to overcome the influence, the process ends in death; if it succeeds, the result is a restoration to health.

Thus it is with Christianity, in the process of its development. The elements by which it is surrounded, and which it takes into union with itself, in order that it may operate upon them, are pervaded with evil. The life of Christianity, as it manifests itself in and through them, is accordingly somewhat modified, and partakes externally of their character. This participation in their character, however, so far as it is evil or imperfect, Christianity endeavors in the course of its progress to overcome and reject; and hence conflicts arise within the Church between the evil inherent in the elements it has received from the world, and its own life which is perfectly pure and opposed to evil. This conflict always finally results in the

destruction of the evil. For the life of the Church is received from Christ, and therefore, not only entirely free from sin, but possessed also of an inherent power to triumph over it, under all its forms. In this consists the true infallibility, or *indelectibility*, of the Church, that, though like Peter, often and sorely tried, and sometimes for a while overcome by sin, in the end it will come forth from the conflict, through the life of Christ which dwells in it, completely victorious. And in this way is the promise of the Saviour, to be with His Church always, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, fulfilled.

It is evident from what has just been said, that this theory does not (as some seem to have imagined,) vindicate as good, whatever practices or opinions have at any time prevailed in the Christian Church, on the ground that they are all to be regarded as the proper products of the Church's life, in its process of development, and therefore, the genuine and absolutely true manifestations of the nature of Christianity. The theory vindicates as right, that only which is the *legitimate* result of the Church's life, and considers even that not absolutely, but only relatively right. It maintains, *first*, that neither the doctrinal views, nor ethical principles, nor government, nor anything else connected with the Church, are now absolutely perfect and true, because the Church itself has, as yet, no such character, not having yet arrived at the full and complete apprehension of all the truth that is comprehended in, and revealed to us, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently, as has been already stated, that the views, practices, government, worship, and every other form in which the Christian religion actualizes itself, will not be absolutely perfect, until the Church itself, free from all error, and purged from all sin, shall reflect, in all its fulness, the absolute truth of Him, who is the brightness of His Father's glory, and "the express image of His person."

In the *second* place, this theory ascribes the character of relative truth not to everything that manifests itself in the Church, in the course of its history, but *only* to that which is

the *legitimate* product of its *own proper* life. Other manifestations it condemns as sinful. It acknowledges the fact, that forms of evil will be found in all ages and countries, adhering to, and existing in the Church, *not* because Christianity produces them, *but because* Antichrist "sitteth in the temple of God," and is untiring in his work of wickedness,—because the individuals, which the Church receives into its bosom from the world, are tainted with imperfection and evil, and because the influence of the world itself opposes and interferes with the regular, harmonious development of the Church's life. The theory regards these evil manifestations, therefore, not as the genuine products of Christianity, but as *ab-normal*, *il-legitimate*, *un-natural* excrescences, holding a relation to Christianity similar to that which poisonous, parasitical plants, growing on the trunk of a tree, whose nature is to bear healthful, delicious fruit, have to the tree itself, or which cancerous ulcers have to the living body. When the Church shall have purged out from the elements, which she receives into herself from the world, all the sin, which infects them, and shall also have driven sin entirely out of the world, then, but not till then, shall she, "not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing," be perfect in all respects in outward form and manifestation, as well as in inward substance and life, a complete and perfect likeness of Him, whose "body" she is, and who in his own absolute beauty and truth, is "fairer than the children of men," "the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely."

Nor is there any room for mistake, on this point, as to the opinions of Drs. Nevin and Schaff, by those who have *thought*, while reading their works. Dr. Nevin has given, in one of his treatises, a history of the existence of heresy in the Church, from the times of the Apostles to the present day, under one of its most fatal forms. In another treatise, he says, in reference to this very subject of development: "In certain circumstances it may be necessary that false tendencies should work themselves out through a long, vast experiment of disastrous consequences, before they can be so brought home to the consciousness of the Church in their root and principle, as to ad-

mit-of a radical cure." Says Dr. Schaff: "Freedom from sin and error may be predicated of Christ and the Church triumphant, but *not* of the Church militant. \* \* Every stage of development has its corresponding *disease*. That the process of development should pass through diseases, might be presumed, even from the analogy of our natural existence; it results with necessity from the elements of sin and error, that still cleave to the Church in her militant state, as well as from her connexion with the unregenerate world, whose influence, she is continually made to feel. These diseases form the Antichristian power in the Church, which also has a development of its own. The secularized, tyrannical papacy, is a diseased excrescence or swelled tumor of Catholicism. Rationalistic, and sectarian Pseudo-Protestantism, is a distortion of the original spirit of the Reformation. We ought to acknowledge and love Christ always, wherever and in whatever form he may appear. So also we ought to contend against Antichrist in all places; and he is to be found assuredly in all Christian confessions. Where God builds a temple, the devil is sure to have a chapel alongside."\* *Historical Development*, pp. 94, 98, 99.

\* In the face of such declarations, as we have quoted above, we find in the last July number of the "Theological and Literary Journal," (a Quarterly, published in New York,) an article from the pen of the editor, from which we quote the following, written professedly as a confutation of the theory under discussion: "Do thorns ever grow on grape-vines, or thistles on fig-trees, by development? And if they are ever made to spring from them, is it not by inoculation? No more are false doctrines and impious rights of worship developed out of the true by Christianity. When introduced into the faith and practice of the Church, as parts of the Christian system, it is by artificial insertion, as violent and unnatural as the ingrafture of a thorn-bough on a grape-vine, or a thistle-branch on a fig-tree. *This great fact*, which holds as absolutely in theology as it does in botany," (precisely that expressed above) "*is overlooked* by the shallow disciples of the development theory. All the parts of a plant that unfold from its seed, are the natural product of its constitution; are consistent with each other, and contribute to perfect it, and cause it to fill the office for which it is formed. If, in any instance, members of other plants are found incorporated with it, it is instantly known that they are artificial and unnatural insertions. *Not so*, however, on Dr. Nevins's theory. If he found branches of the poisonous elder, the sumach, the laurel, the thorn, and a score of other useless or deadly shrubs, springing from the stock of a Newtown pippin, he would, on the principle of his theory, regard them as the natural evolutions of that apple-tree, and essential elements of its nature."

This seems as though Mr. Lord had systematically represented the advocates of the theory of historical development, to believe precisely the opposite of what they do believe, and of what they have repeatedly declared, and then,

If we contemplate the peculiar features which have characterized Christianity at different periods of its history, we will find them sustaining an organic relation to each other, and to Christianity itself, as the natural products of the same common life, unfolding itself from one form into another still higher, thus verifying the theory, whose fundamental principle we have endeavored to illustrate.

We cannot exhibit this more clearly than has been done in the "Preliminary Essay to the Mystical Presence." We accordingly quote from it: "Christianity in its substantial contents has always been the same. The form of its apprehension, however, on the part of the Church, has varied with the onward progress of its history. \* \* \* \* It started, as before remarked, in the character of a new *life*. So it meets us, with full harmony and perfection, in the person of its Founder. So it is exhibited to us more inadequately in the apostles and the apostolic Churches. The mere existence of this life, however, was not enough. It was necessary that the Church should come to a full and free apprehension of what it comprehended. This called for a separation of its elements,

with great show of zeal, and parade of logic, had vigorously set himself to work to demolish them. He controverts, earnestly, principles which they deny as heartily as he, and manifests holy abhorrence of conclusions, which, in most cases, they reject, as decidedly as he, and calling to his aid common sense, natural science, history, philosophy, and Scripture, he accomplishes their most complete discomfiture. We know that Mr. Lord is not stupid. We are unwilling to think him wilfully and maliciously dishonest. There is but one other way of accounting for his gross misrepresentations, and utter perversion of the views he pretends to confute. We can conceive the possibility of an individual wearing green spectacles so long, and constantly, that he would come in the end to think that all natural objects have the hue of green. And, in charity to Mr. Lord, we must believe that in looking at this subject through a wrong medium, he has unsettled his judgment, and lost his powers of perception and discrimination. He seems to have started out on the principle that "Dr. Nevins' views of God, creatures, and Christianity," and his "Pantheistic and Development theories," were worse than anything he could possibly imagine, or depict; and on that ground appears to feel himself fully justified in charging upon him the most absurd principles, and the most revolting and blasphemous conclusions. We commend the article as a psychological curiosity, to those who feel inclined to philosophize on the disastrous influence, which prejudice, however taken up, may exert, consciously or unconsciously, upon the truthful operation of the mental and moral faculties. For the information and benefit of those, who, like us, may hold this "development theory," we append a few of Mr. Lord's statements, taken at random from his article:

involving necessarily more or less confusion and conflict, and one-sided action, as the only process by which it was possible, in the present state of the world, to advance from the simplicity of childhood to the consciousness of spiritual manhood. Hence, the long course of development, revealed to us in Church history. In this process, the different constituent elements, or forces, included in Christianity, could not, in the nature of the case, come in promiscuously at one time for such share of attention as they were entitled to claim. Some one interest must still take the lead of another, determined by the general character of the time; and thus, for every grand period in history, we have a particular side of Christianity standing forth prominently to view, as its dominant characteristic form, till in the end, as the result of the whole process, all such single and separate manifestations may come to be united again in the full, symmetrical perfection of that one glorious life to which they severally belong."

"The process now mentioned, began naturally with *doctrine*, which it was attempted first to settle in a general way, and then in single articles. The dogma-producing period extends in particular, from the fourth century on into the sixth. For

"Following then in the train of Schelling, the theory on which he (Dr. Nevin) founds all his doctrinal speculations, is, that the Deity is the only absolute existence: that created things, instead of being separate, are but embodiments of him in finite forms; that man is the highest of those forms; that God has no personality or consciousness, until he unfolded himself in man," "that man himself is God in a finite form;" "that man is the deity in a finite form." "It (the theory of development) denies the possibility of the work of redemption." "It exhibits the Saviour as no more a divine being than every other individual of the human race is." "It denies the existence in the Godhead of a trinity of persons." It makes men to be "sanctified immediately by the contact, or incorporation into themselves of the sacramental elements as physical substances." "It gives a perfect sanction to all the false doctrines, superstitious rites, and unholy practices, which have ever gained a place in the Church, and to all the impious and debasing religions, also, of the Pagan world. It gives a similar sanction to all the impious and debasing acts of which men have ever been guilty." "The eating of the forbidden fruit, by our first parents, was legitimate." "The lawless profligacy of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah was legitimate," &c.

These are literal extracts, and are not only quoted literally, but bear, also, in every instance, the same force which they have in their proper connection in the article itself. If Mr. Lord, through his Millenarian notions, or some other cause, has not become intellectually and morally demented, we commend to him the faithful and serious study of Exodus 20: 16, and James 3: 14.

this service the *Grecian* mind, which was then predominant in the Church, might be said to have a special vocation. With the fall of the old world, and the rise of a new life among the western nations, Christianity was required to exercise its power in a different way. It must form the manners, and regulate the life, of the rude population with which it was called to deal. The main interest now, accordingly, was its moral authority. It became in the hands, particularly, of the *Roman* Church, a system of *Law*, a pedagogic institute for the government of the nations. In this character, however, it only made room for itself to appear, with new life, as the *Gospel*; a change effected chiefly through the German spirit, which included in its very constitution an evangelical, or free tendency, and was gradually prepared to assert its ecclesiastical independence in this way. With the Reformation, the mind of the Church, no longer in its minority, forced its way back to the proper fountain-head of Christianity, and laid hold of it in the form of *Redemption*; the justification of the sinner before God, and the principle of *freedom*, for the consciousness of the justified subject himself in all his relations. Along with these three leading conceptions of Christianity, as doctrine, as a system of law, and as a source of redemption and spiritual freedom, we find still a fourth, unfolding itself from an early period, with steadily increasing strength. It is the view, which makes religion to consist in the union of man with God, and of course finds in this the distinctive character of Christianity. It is regarded as the absolutely perfect religion, because it *unites the divine and human fully as one life.*" \* \* \*

"Such are the ground types, by which the conception of Christianity has been differently moulded under different circumstances. They are characteristically represented by as many several forms of *Church* life. The interest of doctrine finds its proper expression in the *Greek* Church, self-styled significantly the *Orthodox*, the Church of Christian *Antiquity*. As a disciplinary institute, the Christian system has its fit character in the *Roman* Church, with its claim of universal authority challenging for itself the title *Catholic*, the Church of the *Mid-*



*dle Ages.* To the idea of redemption and freedom answers the Church which has sprung up among the nations of *German* extraction, rightly denominated *Evangelical*, the Church of the *Reformation*. The Church finally in which all these stages of development are to be carried forward together to their highest truth, under a form of Christianity that shall actualize the conception of a full life-union with God, and to which it may be trusted the ecclesiastical agitations of our own time form the transition, may be characterized as the *Church of the Future*, whose attributes shall be spirituality, catholicity, and freedom, joined together in the most perfect combination."

If we contemplate Christianity under any of its particular aspects, we will find in its history, the same general law of organic development exhibiting itself. Thus in the case of doctrine, under the operation of this law, the Church arrived, by a long and gradual process only, at a clear and full apprehension of what, in the beginning she held in the form only, of feeling or general conviction and belief. In this process, the first doctrine which came to view, (as in the necessity of the case was to be expected,) was the existence and nature of God, more particularly in reference to the three persons of the Godhead, and their relation to each other—or the doctrine of the Trinity; next, the constitution of the Saviour's person, as human and divine, and the relation of the two natures subsisting in him; then the original relation of man to God, his present fallen condition, and the method of salvation, involving the questions of original sin, total depravity, the atonement, grace, and free-will. Having thus grown gradually, and through long continued and severe dialectical and theological conflicts, to a clear consciousness of separate doctrines, the Church next turned its attention to them as mutually related to each other. Reflection upon truth naturally succeeded inquiry after truth. A tendency to form doctrinal systems, accordingly soon made itself manifest. This tendency was most active among the scholastics of the middle ages, who did good service, in uniting and exhibiting in a harmonious manner the doctrines which the Church had already come to apprehend separately. But in their zeal to satisfy this want, they ran

into extremes, and often wasted their strength in hair-splitting distinctions. From having its attention at first turned mainly to the development of particular doctrines, and those relating mostly to the nature of God and the Trinity, the Church was led for a time to forget and practically undervalue the ethical side of Christianity. Hence the Greek Church, which was principally engaged in this work, lost its activity, in a great degree, and became stiffened in the dogmas of a lifeless orthodoxy,—a character it still retains. By way of reaction from this mistake, and because of the more practical character of the anthropological doctrines of Christianity, (upon which its attention was chiefly fixed) the Roman Church soon became conscious of the ethical element which is involved in the Christian religion and engaged actively in its development and exhibition. It was also constrained to perform this work, by the necessity of reducing to moral order, the immense mass of rude material thrown suddenly into its bosom from the North of Europe. Hence the legalistic aspect of the middle ages and, the tendency then frequently manifest to regard Christianity as mainly a system of moral precepts, by the observance of which man might be restored to the favor of God. Justification was thus made to depend upon faith, in the form merely of an acceptance of the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, and on works as constituting an actual obedience to those precepts. This co-ordination of faith and works could not continue long, but soon fell practically into an undervaluing of faith and a dependence on works.

By way of reaction, again, from this view, the Church-consciousness was carried over to the doctrine of justification by faith alone. This was not, however, simply a return to the old Augustinian idea, but an advance to one much higher; and yet, in fact, this could not have been reached, except through the view we have just mentioned. For all earnest minds in the Catholic Church, in relying upon good works, relied upon them not as performed in their own strength, but by the assistance of God, and thus fell back upon His grace as the ultimate ground of their righteousness, which principle leads, by just and legitimate development, to the doctrine of justification by

faith alone. Thus, the Church of the middle ages, by its legalistic character, holds to the Church of the Reformation, a relation similar to that which subsisted between the Law and the Gospel, or John the Baptist and the Saviour. It served, by its stern discipline, to enable the Christian consciousness to apprehend and possess the element of Evangelical Freedom which Christianity includes; (for true freedom can be attained only through previous obedience.) It made possible, and prepared the way, for a higher and better order of things, by which it should be abolished in the form in which it had existed, and yet, in its substance and truth, permanently preserved and elevated.\*

It remains for us to notice an objection commonly made to the principles which we have been endeavoring to illustrate, namely, that they favor in their conclusions the exclusive claims of the Roman communion to being alone the true Catholic Church of Christ. Before noticing further this objection, which we think is without just foundation, we must first candidly say, that we have very little respect for the spirit which but too often prompts the objection, in the form in which it is usually made. Very many of the religious papers and periodicals of the day, seem disposed to favor or denounce ideas brought to their notice, not according to their truth, or falsity, but according to the extent to which it is supposed that they will produce benefit or injury to particular interests. The inquiry that is pressed with most earnestness, is not, are the principles themselves true, but are the effects likely to result from them, such as are considered desirable. Such a spirit generally leads, in the end, to hidden dishonesty, and to attempts to compromise or oppose truth, under the cloak of great show of zeal for truth.

---

\* The above is the substance of an article sketched some considerable time ago, but which circumstances then prevented us from finishing. Amid other engagements and imperfect health, we have hastily modified it, and made additions. This will, partly, at least, account for its defective form, and for the numerous, and perhaps, too lengthy notes, which had better often have been incorporated with the substance of the article itself. It seems unnecessary, and yet, perhaps, it may be well to say, that no pretension whatever, is made to any originality of thought. The writer's views are obtained from the study of works he has already mentioned.

So, in reference to the alleged Romanizing tendency of these views, we have just as little respect for the spirit in which the objection has often been urged. What if the principles should favor in their conclusions the claims of the Church of Rome, provided the principles themselves are true? It is, nevertheless, unquestionably our duty to receive them.

Personally, we have no special love for the Roman communion, as such, and still less, for its practices; and we certainly are unconscious of the slightest disposition to add any of its errors or corruptions to the imperfections of our own Protestantism; but if a true principle should legitimately produce conclusions verifying any or all of the peculiar features of the Roman Church, we cannot see that in such case we would be under any the less obligation to receive and confess the truth. In fact this cry of "Romanizing tendency," is becoming too well understood, to deceive any one. Like the talk of nurses designed to frighten children, it is often a mere "*bugaboo*," intended merely to create prejudice against a theory which may not accord with the wishes or notions of those who raise the cry, and who are too lazy, or not able, to oppose it with sound argument.

The theory which we have been discussing, cannot, under any form, be turned into an argument in favor of the exclusive claims of Rome. The most that can be legitimately made of it, by those who may desire so to use it, is, a historical justification of some of the features of the Romish Church, as growing out of the wants of the Church, and the exigencies of the times, when those features were produced. But the same principles which thus justify them relatively, as the products of a certain stage of Christianity, pronounce just as clearly and decisively their condemnation, when any attempt is made to usurp for them a permanent place in Christian worship and practice; a conclusion fatal to the claims of Rome in their exclusive character. And even this relative justification can be made out only by showing that the features contended for, are the genuine and legitimate out-growths of the Christian spirit of the age. The whole question turns upon the fact of their le-

gitimacy. The principle itself settles nothing; every thing in the end depends upon its application.

But in another way the theory of organic development is fatal to the exclusive pretensions of Rome. It is utterly irreconcilable with her claims to infallibility, and to the Pope being the representative of Christ on earth, the permanent head of his entire Church. To make good the Roman Catholic doctrine on these points, we must, like the Puseyite on the one hand, and the modern Puritan on the other, regard Christianity as perfect, not only in its essential nature, but also in the outward exhibition of itself in every particular, possessed of an externally complete, and entirely defined system of doctrine, practice, worship, and government, &c. Being thus perfect, and thus continuing perfect, and therefore, unchangeable, it must be necessarily infallible. In addition to this, admit that Peter was head of the Church, in the manner in which the Pope is now of the Roman communion, and the demands of Romanists must be conceded as just. But the theory under discussion flatly contradicts these assumptions at several points. It denies that the Church was thus perfect, in primitive times, or that it ever has been, or is now perfect; and therefore, not infallible. It regards the Church as progressing from imperfection towards perfection; which perfection now exists only in the person of Christ, and which the Church shall possess only when it perfectly reflects His image. So, too, this theory admits and contends for the fact, that changes will take place in the Church, in regard to government, as well as to doctrinal views and worship, and therefore, on this point directly opposes the hierarchical claims of Rome. The circumstance that Newman has attempted to defend the distinctive features of Romanism, by a theory of development, has doubtless misled some, through the similarity of the terms used in both theories, into a mistake in regard to the tendency of that which we have tried to illustrate. They, however, differ in toto. Newman, indeed, recognizes no development of the *principle of Christianity* in the Church, but only of thought and opinion, a wider application and unfolding of ideas

only. And even this is regarded by most Romanists as entirely incompatible with their faith. Brownson says, it may do for *Protestants*, but not for Catholics.

We believe that the theory, whose ground principles we have tried to state, furnishes a most powerful, and indeed, irrefragable argument *in favor* of Protestantism, and *against* the exclusive claims of Rome; proving that the former is the genuine and legitimate offspring of the life of Him who dwells in his Church in all ages, and who in the Reformation of the sixteenth century, carried it forward and upward to a higher stage of its progress. We have not attempted to define particularly the conditions which determine the process by which Christianity develops itself in the world, nor the manner in which this process is carried forward. The field for thought here is very wide and inviting, indeed, but, at the same time, very difficult; opinions here, too, would doubtless differ often very widely. In some respects also certainty, even so far as usually possible to human speculation, is unattainable. For while human means are undoubtedly employed, and finite conditions permitted powerfully to affect the process, yet still, at the same time, it is wholly, and in all its stages, under the control of Him to whom all power has been given in heaven and on earth, and whose ways and thoughts are far above ours, as far as the heavens are above the earth. Those, however, who may wish to investigate this side of the subject, will find no little assistance, as well as derive no little information from the study of the Rev. Dr. Schaff's treatise on the question: "What is Church History?" We have endeavored merely to illustrate the *principles* on which the idea of an organic development of Christianity in the world, is fundamentally based. Those who desire to study or discuss those principles, may find them in the three following propositions:

I. *Christianity is ESSENTIALLY a new Life.*

II. *Christianity, as Life, is governed in its action by the LAW of LIFE.*

III. *This Law of Life is that of growth, or ORGANIC DEVELOPMENT.*

Norristown, Pa.

G. D. W.

## ART. III.—THE DUTCH CRUSADE.

It is to be presumed, that even our Dutch brethren themselves, as well as their small company of misguided allies in our own body, have become pretty well satisfied by this time, that their late attempt to get up a Dominican crusade against the German Reformed Church, was both wrong and unwise. There was no occasion for it, and it has accomplished nothing but the contrary of what the movers of it proposed. It was a grand impertinence from first to last; and it is sufficiently plain, that it is so regarded by the good sense and right feeling of the community generally, the very tribunal whose verdict, from the peculiar circumstances of the case, was most confidently expected to go in its favor.

## THE CASE IN ITS FACTS.

There was no fit occasion, we say, for any such denominational assault. The ostensible plea for it, as all know, was the charge of certain wrong tendencies on the part of the great body of the German Reformed Church, which a small faction of discontented minds in its bosom, pretending to be particularly evangelical and orthodox, had no power to redress, without the aid and comfort of such foreign ecclesiastical *intervention*. But curious enough was the process by which it was pretended to establish the truth of this grave accusation. The Church still professed to hold the Heidelberg Catechism, and had never before in truth shown itself more in earnest in magnifying its authority and insisting upon its use. No doctrine had been pronounced ecclesiastically, which could be said to call for reconsideration or repeal. No step had been taken by the Church, no rule imposed, no decision given, which could be regarded as in the least degree changing its creed or constitution, or laying so much as the shadow of embarrassment



on any man's conscience, however tender or weak. There was nothing positively, in the action of the Church as such, that could be said to require either remedy or reform; not so much as an inch of ground, on which to plant fairly an issue with it in any measure answerable to the gravity of the charge in question. All fell back on the vague general statement, that the Professors at Mercersburg had been for some years past publishing views, which the anti-catholic spirit of the times chooses to stigmatize as *Romanizing*, and that the Synod of the German Reformed Church had not called them to account for so doing, at the cry simply of this same spirit.

This offence was taken to have reached its climax, when the Synod, nearly two years ago, refused to receive the resignation of the senior Professor, simply because it was seen at the time that there was a disposition with some to make an unrighteous use of the case, by construing it into a virtual act of censure. There was of course no room for that; for there had been no charges tabled and no trial of any sort then or before; it never suited the policy of Berg, Helffenstein & Co., to proceed in any such regular and honorable way. The body of the Synod, moreover, was fully persuaded that there was no just cause for prosecution of any sort, and that the agitators in the case could neither form nor sustain charges amounting to what they loosely affirmed. There was proof enough of this indeed in the simple fact, that with full opportunity given them for the purpose, year after year, they had all along refused to make the attempt in a regular and constitutional form. Had they done so and failed, there might have been *some* show of reason in their pretending that the Synod would not allow justice to take its course; although even then it would have been hard to say, why *their* judgment must be accepted as right, and that of the Synod condemned as wrong. But no such issue was ever joined. They never gave the Synod a chance to try their complaints. They demanded rather that their agitation should pass for a full prejudgment of the whole case, and that the Synod should act upon this as a sentence already established and settled beyond contradiction. This

the Synod would not consent to do. Had there been a general conviction in the body that there was cause for prosecution and censure, no other course could properly have been taken, in the default of everything like a regular inquisition and trial. How could such a body consent to resolve itself in this way into a tribunal of mere Lynch law? But, as already said, there was no conviction of the sort named; but a very strong and general conviction just the other way; a conviction, namely, that the agitation in question could not make good its own indefinite charges and accusations, and was to be regarded as in the main malicious and unjust. *In such circumstances*, what must have been thought of the German Reformed Synod if it could have allowed itself to become the tool of any such irresponsible prosecution, passively lending itself to its iniquitous views and aims? By an almost unanimous vote, as it will be remembered, the body not only refused to enact what in the predicament of the case would have been construed into a virtual condemnation of the Mercersburg Professors, but went still farther: passed resolutions, declaring its unabated confidence in them, its approbation of what it conceived to be the reigning drift of their teaching, and its wish to retain their services still under the same general form in its institutions.

Out of this proceeding, it has been endeavored since to raise what some have facetiously affected to call a *crisis* in the history of the German Reformed Church. Dr. Berg did not himself, indeed, see it in that light just at first; and no one more distinctly condemned the use which was made of it by his hot-headed colleague, the Rev. Jacob Helffenstein, in his famous alarm put forth at the time, through the religious papers of other denominations. In a marvellously short time, however, he was brought to change his key. Whatever *other* reasons may have influenced the step, it was found convenient to lionize his transition to the Low Dutch Church, by making it a step for conscience' sake; and he now fell in, accordingly, with the hue and cry which had been got up in certain quarters on the outside, that the German Reformed Synod had formally endorsed all the views of its Professors, and that these

views were all that Tom, Dick, and Harry saw fit to make them, after their own crude fashion and humor.

Then came the report of the Dutch delegates to their own Synod, designed to help forward the same misrepresentation, by clothing it with a sort of documentary semi-official authority on the minutes of that body. Altogether, it was a most unbecoming paper. The delegates had no right to act as hostile spies, under the garb of pretended friends, and to lay themselves out to serve the views of a disorganizing clique, in the bosom of the body whose ecclesiastical hospitalities they were permitted to enjoy without suspicion or reserve. But if they did consider this bad office to be their privilege, they were bound, at all events, to exercise it with some regard to truth and right. When it was proposed to prejudice in such public style the whole merits of the case in hand, and on the force of such prejudication to bring the sweeping charge of heresy against a whole sister denomination, the least they could have been expected to do certainly was to have taken proper pains to study and understand the business they meant to judge, by waiting to see it to an end, and by trying to get at its real nature and sense. This, however, they did not do; and their report turned out to be, accordingly, as false in point of fact as it was ungentlemanly in purpose and spirit. It treated the case in hand as if it had been one of formal trial; when it had been, in truth, an attempt only to evade the responsibility of a regular prosecution, by securing snap judgment in another way. It assumed that the version put upon the matter at issue by the agitators, was already so much settled truth, when there had been no inquisition at all to establish anything of that sort. And then it construed the action of the Synod at once into a formal ratification, not only of all the actual views of the Mercersburg Professors, but of all that these views were taken and charged to be by this same arbitrary version; when, in reality, the action of the Synod carried in it no such intention or sense whatever. No wonder that such a paper received by the Synod of the Dutch Church, excited general indignation in the Church which was thus wronged, and that the Ger-

man Reformed Synod protested against it, as was done in Baltimore in the fall of 1852. The language of that protest may have been rather unguarded at some points; but the provocation was very great, and the notice thus taken of it was felt to be in substance not any too strong for the occasion. Several of the Classes subsequently confirmed it by their separate action; and no doubt a wide disposition was created in the Church, to have a summary stop put to the whole correspondence which had been so outrageously diverted from its original design, in the service of a barefaced conspiracy against the unity and peace of the German Reformed Church itself. Happily, however, any action which it might have been proposed to take in this form was anticipated by the Synod of the Dutch Church at its last meeting in Philadelphia. In these circumstances, the satisfaction of doing wrong has fallen wholly to the one side, while the merit of suffering it with calm dignity and patience belongs exclusively to the other. Let us hope that this latter privilege will be steadily maintained by the German Reformed Church, in the spirit of Jesus Christ.

The Dutch Church, we say, has done wrong in this whole business. Her delegates did wrong in the first place; and her Synod rendered the matter a great deal worse, when it made itself responsible for their fault, and, pretending to put on the airs of an injured party, proceeded at once to break correspondence with the German Reformed Church, on the alleged ground of its being involved in false and heretical tendencies, which the orthodoxy of the Dutch Church felt itself too pure to tolerate even by such exceedingly remote contact. Never was there a more monstrously gross abuse of a simply outward and, at best, merely diplomatic relation. Who will pretend that the correspondence established as a matter of courtesy only between sister denominations, each equally independent, can ever fairly give one the right of virtually summoning the other before its self-constituted tribunal in this overbearing way, and the right of formally passing sentence of condemnation against it, on its own loose, indefinite indictment, without any examination, or the least opportunity allowed for defence

or reply? For nothing less than this was designed to be the effect, in fact, of the action taken by the Synod of the Low Dutch Church. It was part of a conspiracy formed, as all may easily see, to produce agitation and division in the German Reformed Church, for the purpose of giving a paltry minority in it the power of turning its affairs according to their own factious wish and will. The plan was fair and plausible. Advantage was to be taken of the anti-popery spirit, which is so rampant on all sides, and the blinding power of which might seem to be almost without bounds. The religious papers were to echo one another, in the way of continual alarm. Noise was to be made of defections, and threatened defections, from the German Church. Sister denominations, it was hoped, might be engaged to separate themselves from its communion, so as to get up a panic among its uninformed membership, and to open the way thus for all sorts of reformatory confusion. The Dutch Synod agreed to take the lead in this movement; and it did so for the *acknowledged purpose* of strengthening the hands of the revolutionary faction in the German Reformed Church, and stirring up a crusade on the part of the laity, to be led on by the ministers of this faction, against the order and peace of the Church as a whole. It was Kossuthian intervention with a vengeance. Who gave the Dutch Church a right to interfere with the affairs of the German Reformed Church, in this dogmatical and high-blown style? If it had been wished to drop the correspondence, it might easily have been done in a quiet and courteous way by mutual consent. The just subject of complaint is, that advantage should have been taken of a mere relation of courtesy to give the suspension on the side of the Dutch Church a quasi-judicial character before the world, that it might be clothed in this way with a factitious importance which did not belong to it in fact; and that the professed object of all this was to sow the seeds of dissension and anarchy, as far as possible, in the German Reformed Church. For this there can be no excuse.

The excuse pretended is thin and poor in the extreme. The German Reformed Church, it is said, has endorsed all the

views of the Mercersburg Professors, and these views are seriously wrong. But what precisely were the views in question, the Dutch Synod never pretended to say or know in distinct terms; much less was it considered necessary to subject them to any theological investigation. It was counted sufficient to take them at second hand, and to gather them up into the convenient category of "Romanizing tendencies." Then, again, it had no proof before it whatever that the Synod of the German Reformed Church had ever intended to endorse all the teachings of its Professors even rightly understood. To approve of the general system of teaching pursued by a Professor, and to be satisfied with his services on the whole, and not to listen to complaints against him which nobody is prepared to reduce to shape or form, is one thing; to subscribe to all his particular notions and declarations, is quite another thing. The German Reformed Synod has done the first of these two things, without the most distant thought of anything so foolish as the second. It belongs to the genius of the Church to allow here a certain degree of liberty, which, in some way, the mind of the Dutch Church would seem not able exactly to comprehend. Following the voice of her delegates accordingly, she has insisted on holding the German Reformed Church responsible for whatever it has suited her imagination to ascribe to the so-called Mercersburg system; and on such flimsy plea, she pretends now to justify the outrage by which she has been endeavoring, for some time past, to drive the ploughshare of desolation through the borders of this sister communion. For the aggression has not been limited to the action of her Synod in Philadelphia. That was but the signal rather for farther hostilities, the object of which has been nothing less than the dragooning of the whole German Reformed Church into the system of thinking graciously proffered for her use in the columns of the New York "*Christian Intelligencer*". This paper, the organ of the Dutch Church, has shown, during the past summer, as is generally known, a perfectly rabid spirit towards the German Reformed Church, hardly surpassed in scurrility and misrepresentation by the "*Lutheran Observer*" it-

self in its palmy days. It seemed to look upon itself as the natural guardian of the interests of orthodoxy among the Germans, and has shrunk from no indelicacy in order to carry this fancied commission into effect. It has granted the free use of its columns to any disaffected minister, or layman, of the German Reformed Church, who could be induced to make them the channel of his spleen or pride; besides encouraging every scribbler at home to write what trash he pleased in the same vein and for the same general purpose. It even undertook to regulate the election of a President for Franklin and Marshall College; and by the help of its few friends in the German Reformed Church, it has had the impudence to seek a forcible entry for itself among our pastors and congregations, under the insolent pretence that the "German Reformed Messenger," the paper of our own Church, was in a plot to keep the people in the dark, and that we needed the light of the "*Christian Intelligencer*" among us to know how to take care of ourselves and to do our own work. Never was there such impudent interference before in the history of our American religious denominations; and never was there a more sorry plea presented in justification of any such aggression.

Only suppose the Dutch Church claiming the right to interfere in this style with the affairs of the Presbyterian Church; who can doubt for a moment how the intervention would be received? It would be treated as an impertinence of the first order. The only reason for its being thought of towards the German Reformed Church is, that we are a comparatively small body, and that the reigning anti-popery feeling was expected to come in as a cover to the wrong which it has been presumed to perpetrate at our expense. But it is remarkable, that even this feeling has not proved strong enough to secure for our Dutch neighbors the favor they hoped to find with other denominations in this crusade against the German Reformed Church. The pedantry of the thing has been too *characteristic* to go down favorably in any quarter. It was expected and planned to draw the O. S. Presbyterian Assembly into the conspiracy; but that body refused to lend itself to any such in-



glorious service. The religious papers, too, (the "Lutheran Observer" *always* excepted in any such case,) have preserved, generally, an ominous silence on the subject, at most noticing the action of the Dutch Church simply as an item of intelligence, with no mark of sympathy or approbation, and taking no reference whatever to the later agitational efforts of the "Christian Intelligencer." This, in the circumstances, is very significant, and amounts to a full reprobation of the course pursued by the Dutch Church, as having been at least silly, if not positively wrong. That Church has gained no laurels by what she has done. The whole relation, it is not to be questioned, is bringing more credit at this hour to the German Reformed Church, than it has brought yet, or ever will bring to the Low Dutch.

Still less has the crusade served to accomplish what it was expected to bring to pass, in the German Reformed Church itself. It is wonderful, indeed, how little it has had power to do here in the way of harm, and how signally it has been turned already to the confusion of those who allowed themselves to be carried away by its blustering parade. We have had, indeed, some internal commotion, for which the Dutch intervention would seem to have been at this time the only cause. After more than a whole year's rest, and with no new point of provocation in the Church whatever, (unless any might choose to construe as such, the action taken in regard to the Presidency of Franklin and Marshall College,) a few persons were led to start suddenly into a fit of reformation, which it was hoped would bring about in some way, a new order of things for the Church at large. In what way precisely, no one seemed able to tell. Enough, that the time appeared to be favorable for agitation, and that there was a promise of some distinction for those who could contrive to ride upon its foremost wave. We doubt if ever there has been a movement of the sort, pretending to cut so much of a figure, which was less able to give any satisfactory reason for its appearance, or to return any intelligent answer to the question: Pray what is it you want, and what exactly do you propose to secure? Such as it

was, however, it was not to be stopped in its own course. Helffenstein's secession played into its hands. Then the impotent demonstration made by the little Classis of North Carolina. Of the real insignificance of both events for all who know the parties concerned, and the circumstances of their occurrence, it is not necessary here to speak. But they answered well for popular declamation. They made good ammunition for unscrupulous religious newspapers. Hands were joined now openly with the "Christian Intelligencer" in its vile attacks on the German Reformed Church; which was ready, of course, as we have before said, to make itself the vehicle of whatever might be communicated to it in such form. Then it was tried to carry the agitation into the columns of the "German Reformed Messenger;" and because this paper refused to lend itself to any such bad purpose, it was denounced as being itself the grand abuse that called for correction; by which means the itch or tumor of reformation seemed to bring itself at last to some sort of definite head, by promising to itself a revolution which should place the editorial management of the 'Messenger' in altogether new hands. Set sermons were preached in different quarters, to help forward the pretended crisis. Letters were written in all directions, and mention was publicly made of scores of them from all sides, showing the Church to be rife for general disturbance. Much was expected from a certain convention, called to meet in Lancaster for the purpose of manufacturing in some way an epoch in the affairs of the German Reformed Church. Hopes were entertained, also, that the Western Synod might be led to take ground of some sort in favor of the revolutionary movement; and no pains were spared to turn its influence in this direction. But to what, in the end, have all these busy and restless endeavors come? They have simply brought out, more clearly than was seen before, the strength of the cause they were designed to overthrow. The action of the Low Dutch Synod has fallen as a mere *brutum fulmen* on all sides, without any lasting ecclesiastical or moral effect. The "Christian Intelligencer" has made itself to stink. Without noise or tumult, the German Reformed Church has passed an almost unanimous sentence of con-

demnation on the efforts which have been made within her own bosom, at the bidding of this foreign intervention, to destroy her unity and peace. The agitation has produced no crisis. No epoch was created by the secret conclave in Lancaster. By the Triennial Convention at Columbus, and the meeting of the Western Synod since held in Michigan, it has been made evident enough how the mind of the Church stands on the other side of the mountains. The action of the Eastern Synod at Philadelphia, as being more directly concerned in the general case, has been still more decided and conclusive. It is not necessary to speak of it now in detail. It has spoken for itself, with a voice loud enough to be heard, and plain enough to be understood, in every direction.

So much for this small chapter of American ecclesiastical history. The Dutch Church, and the "Christian Intelligencer," have themselves come to see very well, no doubt, that they reckoned sadly without their host, in counting, as they, did upon the elements of discord and division, which they supposed to be at work in the German Reformed Church, and upon the effect which their own interference was expected to have on this combustible material in the way of inflammation. One great reason urged for breaking correspondence with the German Reformed Church, was the effect the measure would have to strengthen the hands of the *evangelical* party in it, (such was the Pharisaical sobriquet applied to those who were bent on making trouble,) and to strike terror into others. The Synod was told at the same time, that the effect would be something very different from this; and so it has proved to be in fact. The Church has been more consolidated than ever before, by the evangelical conspiracy thus got up for her general distraction; and the whole movement on the part of the Dutch Synod stands convicted before the world of being in truth a very weak as well as a very wrong transaction, a grand impertinence, as before said, from beginning to end.

#### GENERAL CONTROVERSY.

Nothing can well be more misty and senseless, than the general complaint preferred in this whole controversy, on the part

of the Dutch and others, against the German Reformed Church. It comes mainly, as we have seen, to the charge of a Romanizing tendency. But this in itself means nothing. For the Unitarian, the doctrine of the Trinity is such a tendency; for the Baptist, the practice of Infant Baptism; for the Congregationalist, the idea of a Divine Ministry, whether after the Presbyterian or the Episcopalian pattern; for the Presbyterian, the notion of Diocesan Bishops; for the Low Episcopalian, the whole Puseyite conception of Sacramental Grace. Whatever the standpoint may be, any other position which is in nearer approximation to the Roman idea of the Church, in any particular, must from such standpoint appear to be a Romanizing tendency. Especially must every churchly view, whether it stops here or there, be so regarded by all thinking which is less churchly than itself. The charge then of a Romanizing tendency is in and of itself without meaning; since all turns in the case on the quarter from which it proceeds. As compared with Unitarians, Baptists, Independents, our American sects in general, and as compared too no doubt with the unchurchly spirit that seems to have the mastery just now in the Low Dutch Church, it is not to be questioned but that the German Reformed Church is under the power of what these several bodies, each holding to its own standpoint, conceive to be a Romanizing tendency. We should be heartily sorry, and would wish to be out of the Church, if it were otherwise. But what then? What right has any of these standpoints, Unitarianism, Congregationalism, Anabaptism, any one in short, of the more than fifty sects that represent our American Christianity, to set itself up as the absolute measure and standard of truth in this case, and to say, Thus far shalt thou go in the direction of the old Catholic faith, but no farther! Why has not the German Reformed Church, as an independent denomination, as much right as any other to settle that question for herself in her own way? To become of any force, the charge in question must make itself definite, must descend to particulars, must say precisely what it means by a Romanizing tendency.

This, however, the party bringing the charge has shown itself

very shy of doing for the most part. Still at times it has ventured on something of the sort. But when it has done so, the instances have been few indeed, in which its points have been fairly put or honorably maintained. It is notorious for all intelligent lookers on, that the controversy on that side, whenever it has come to specific points, has been characterized by continual perversion and misrepresentation, much in the same way with the current popular polemics kept up against the Catholic Church itself. It would seem that the Puritan habit of mind carries in it no capacity for church ideas, so that they are almost sure to be turned by it into falsehood or nonsense, wherever they come in its way. Such a supposition at least is the best apology that can be made for its common want of fairness, in dealing with topics that lie in this direction. In the case before us, this want of fairness has been very strikingly displayed; and the wrong too often has been grossly aggravated, by being perseveringly maintained in the face of the most open disclaimers of its misrepresentations on the part of those wronged. It may be right enough to show that an opinion leads to this or that bad consequence, if with fair logic it can be done; but to confound the opinion itself with such invidious construction, and then to insist on fixing this last at once on an opponent, against his own protest and without allowing it even to be heard, is such an abomination as any truly religious mind might be expected to abhor. Such, however, to a most melancholy extent, has been the style in which the controversy before us has been carried on from first to last. The "Christian Intelligencer" has but played over again of late in this respect, the old game of the "Lutheran Observer" and the "Protestant Quarterly." How seldom has a point against Mercersburg and the German Reformed Church been fairly and honorably presented, in its evangelical columns? The last thing these outlaws of the so-called religious press seem to think of or care about, is the observance of any rule either of justice or honor towards the victims of their aggression. They have as little regard for truth as they have for charity. Their object is not to reach the real merits of anything, but to

carry a point of their own; and whatever of trick or stratagem, concealment or perversion, this may appear to require, all is supposed to have its justification in the fancied goodness of the end they propose in this way to compass and gain. To pretend to reason with this sort of newspaper *theology* would be out of the question—a mere waste of so much breath, poured forth upon the idle wind. It is made up of prejudice and passion only, without reason. You might as well enter into argument with a cloud of bats. You cannot hold it to any point. You cannot fix it to any premises, long enough to draw the plainest conclusion. It delights in all sorts of contradiction and confusion, flitting hither and thither, from corner to corner, and seeking everything, as it might seem, rather than the simple light of truth itself for the truth's own sweet sake. The best that can be done always with such unreasoning obscurantism, or bat-theology, in this low character and shape, is to answer it never a word, but just to let it take its own course till it has fairly run itself out. It is after all but little that it is ever able to bring to pass, under any enduring form. Its noise is for the moment only, and is soon forgotten. This, however, is no excuse for the wickedness of the thing itself. Wrong is not the less wrong, merely because it may be impotent.

Let it not be supposed, however, that we wish to resolve all the accusations of this controversy into mere misrepresentation or passionate mistake, and so to make a simple logomachy out of it, a battle of words rather than of things. Very real issues are indeed involved in it, of the most serious sort, which we have not the least disposition to deny or conceal. Occasionally one or more of these points is suffered to come somewhat plainly into view; while the force of them may be said to enter always as a secret power into those falsely put propositions also, of which we have just now spoken. The false issues are after all polemic devices only got up to cover issues, which are known to be real and true, but which it is felt at the same time not easy to maintain in their own proper form; and this precisely is the latent cause of the intemperate and intolerant

zeal with which such false charges and criminations are insisted upon, without regard to protest or explanation from the contrary side. Thus, for example, when it has been affirmed by the Mercersburg theology, in common with the universal faith of the early Church, and in common with both the original Lutheran and Calvinistic sides of the Reformation, that the presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is such a mystery above nature as sets his whole person, not locally and carnally, but by a higher order of existence through the Spirit, in living communication with the believer; instead of meeting the proposition honestly in its own form, the gainsayers of whom we now speak have made it to mean a Capernaitic presence of Christ's body and blood after the order of nature, and have then held this up to odium as being the same thing with their own gross conception of the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. Here a false point is substituted for the true one, and the controversy becomes an impudent slander which refuses systematically to let the truth be heard; but it is plain enough, at the same time, that what it is really at war with is this truth itself, which, however, it feels it necessary, with a sort of devilish instinct, thus to caricature in the first place, in order that it may fight against it with better chance of success. When all comes out, it is the whole idea of any mystery in the sacrament above nature, the idea of a real communication by it with Christ's body and blood in any way, that is hated and opposed. One thing is pretended and put forward for effect; but quite another thing is in reality meant. One thing is in the mouth; but it is something else entirely that fills the heart. The premises are a simple feint, to conceal the march of a pernicious conclusion which steals in from a different quarter altogether. So in the case of this particular example; and so in a number of other cases, which it would be easy to mention. As a general thing, indeed, whatever the ostensible points may be, there are issues behind them of real significance, which we have no right to overlook and no wish to explain away; and at times, as we have said, these are allowed to come unreservedly into view. God forbid, that we



should treat these as of no account, or consider it an object to come to terms in regard to them with those who make them matter of quarrel with us, in any way that would imply a resolution of the difficulty into a mere contest of words. The difficulty regards things. What we need is, not that these should be hid at all, but that they should be brought fully into the light, without the blind of any sophistical misrepresentation; in which case one of the last things to be thought of should be anything like compromise or common understanding with the opposing party. So far as such real matter of theological controversy extends, it cannot be expected that the German Reformed Church should be solicitous to make her own position mean nothing, over against the system of thinking that may seem to prevail in other denominations; or that she should carry her cause to any such bar for settlement and adjudication. On this real matter of controversy, we should not wish either to be or to appear of one mind with the system around us, but should count it a calamity rather to be in its good graces in any way. There are questions and points here of vital consequence, on which we are bound to see and affirm continually that we are right and those who oppose us wrong. To do so, is a duty we owe, not only to ourselves, but to the general cause of Christianity. It is the merit of the German Reformed Church already to have distinguished herself among the Protestant denominations of the country in asserting, or allowing to be asserted, principles and views here that concern the very life of religion, and which all denominations need to regard and lay to heart, however unpopular they may be now and on most sides exposed to reproach; and it is to be trusted, that this merit will not be lightly thrown away, by any change of voice or posture, in time to come. Already the testimony thus given has had its effect; and it cannot fail, if steadily maintained, to tell with still greater influence on the mind of the community hereafter.

#### THE CREED.

One primary point of difference between the German Reformed Church, as she now stands, and most of the denomina-

tions that surround her, is the importance she is disposed to attach to the *Apostles' Creed*. Her system of faith as presented in the Heidelberg Catechism, it is well known, has rested all along on this foundation. But it is not to be disguised, that there has been within a few years past a marked revival of interest among us in this old symbol, and much more of a disposition than before to make earnest with it as a rule of doctrine and a key to the true and proper sense of Christianity. And just as little is it to be disguised, that this revival of interest among us in the Creed has contributed greatly to draw upon us the disapprobation and distrust of other religious bodies. So far is this the case, that even respectable ministers in such bodies have been known to resolve all our supposed deviations from the straight line of so-called evangelical orthodoxy, as held by our sects generally, into this first principle, that the Creed is of more authority in some way than the Bible, and should be regarded as superior to it in the constitution of the Christian faith! This, however, is to put forward a false issue, in the way we have already described, as a blind to that which is true. The real point is not the relative authority of the Creed and the Bible at all; they are regarded of course as being in the most perfect agreement; but the whole question regards the real sense of the Bible itself, and the necessity of making the original faith of the Church a rule or measure for its interpretation. So the Creed has always been taken, unless among heretics, in past ages. Those, however, who now affect to place honor on the Bible at its expense, take the ground in fact that the last resort for determining the sense of Christianity must be, not the original faith of the Christian Church at all, but the private judgment of every man exercised on the contents of the Bible for his own use and in his own way. This is an abominable proposition, that stands in and of itself at war with all real faith in the general mystery which it is the object of the Apostles' Creed to proclaim; and it soon appears, accordingly, wherever it prevails, that the opposition it expresses to the Creed is not simply formal but material, that it extends in fact, either in whole or in part, to the contents of the symbol itself.

This has been brought out strikingly in the course of the controversy before us with the German Reformed Church. This controversy has served very conclusively to show, that our evangelical sects generally, no less than those which openly discard the doctrine of the Trinity, even while they may have been professing at times, in a cold way, to honor the Creed, have, in truth, no sympathy with it as a whole, and are by no means willing to be ruled by it in their faith. Why, indeed, if this were not the case, should it have gone so almost entirely out of use among these sects? Why is its voice not heard either in the pulpit or in the family? If owned at all, it is always with some exception or qualification. It is not perceived, that its articles go to form a single unit, and that to set aside one, is virtually to set aside all. There is a soul in the Creed, as it entered into the faith of the ancient Church—an energizing and form-giving idea, or thought, which holds it together and imparts to it all its worth; and this, precisely, it is, that renders it unpalatable to the reigning, self-styled evangelical taste of modern times. Rob it of this soul, and the flat residuum may be, at least, partially endured, as a venerable relic of by-gone times. But the Creed, with its own original life in it, can find no favor. We have been openly told, by good authority from New England itself, that “the Creed and Puritanism have not a *kindred spirit*”—that “its life and spirit never entered into the life of the Puritan Churches”—that “Puritanism builds on the Scriptures, and this Creed teaches, in several respects, anti-scriptural doctrines!” Any attempt to restore the “fossil relic” to life again, these Churches hold in scorn. “We look with a sort of pity,” they tell us, “upon those who are laboring to infuse life into it, and to set it up as a living ruler in the Church.” This refers directly to the interest shown for it at Mercersburg, and is very significant in regard to the point now under consideration, as showing that one great cause of controversy with the German Reformed Church, on the side of other sects, is, in truth, just her regard for the authority of the Apostles’ Creed, and the zeal she has exhibited of late for the resuscitation of its proper original life among Protestants.

For it must not be imagined, that this hatred of the Creed, in its own native and first sense, is confined, by any means, to New England. It lies in the very essence of Puritanism; which is another scheme of religion altogether, proceeding from different premises, involving throughout a different construction, and animated, by its own confession, just quoted, with a different life and spirit; and wherever the Puritan element prevails, accordingly, be the denomination what it may, it will always make itself felt in the same way as a spirit of alienation from the *regula fidei* of the Early Church. It is no railing accusation, therefore, which we bring against "American Lutheranism," as represented by Gettysburg and the "Lutheran Observer," or against the American Low Dutch Church, as represented by New Brunswick and the "Christian Intelligencer," when we say, that they, too, have no kindred spirit with the Apostle's Creed, and no power to make an *ex amino* use of it, taking it in its own genuine sense and without any mental reservation, as the true type and image of their faith. They are constitutionally Puritan; and being so, they *cannot* hold the Creed in full sincerity and truth. We may safely challenge either the "Observer" or the "Intelligencer" on this point. Neither of these can say honestly: "I believe from the heart all and every part of the Creed, *in its own original and only true sense.*" They believe no such thing. They are of one mind here substantially with the Boston "Puritan Recorder." The soul of the Creed, its reigning animus, is not at all to their taste, but much, very much, the other way. Of this the world has had ample evidence in their own columns; and here exactly is to be found, beyond all question, no small part of the reason for their animosity towards Mercersburg and the German Reformed Church. If we could have been content to use the Creed as a dead "fossil relic," moulting it from time to time without stopping to think of its sense, our fancy for it might have been patiently indulged. But that we should "labor to infuse life into it," to make it act and speak for itself, to bring out its hidden force, to resuscitate its mysteries in their old form, and "to set it up as a living ruler in

the Church"—this was too much to be tolerated or endured. "*Hinc illæ lachrymæ!*" Hence much at least of this *celestial* indignation.

Let it be well considered, moreover, that this Puritanic dislike of the Creed links itself immediately with the idea of what is vaguely branded, in the same quarter, as a "Romanizing tendency." The "Puritan Recorder" finds the germs of Romanism in some of its articles; and there is no doubt but that the whole of it does involve an apprehension of Christianity, which both the "Lutheran Observer" and the "Christian Intelligencer," as well as the "Recorder," if true to their own theology or no-theology, must condemn and repudiate in the same view. It is not necessary, then, to be much disturbed by so blind a charge, coming from so blind a quarter, when we see in this case something of its veritable meaning and sense. Puritanism sees a "Romanizing tendency" in the Apostles' Creed; snuffs the smell of heresy, under this form, in the articles of the Descent to Hades, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, and the Forgiveness of Sins. What matters it, if, by the same diseased nostrils, the like taint be charged on the German Reformed Church? "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?"

And yet there are some among ourselves, it would seem, who think it necessary to have the orthodoxy of the German Reformed Church approved and endorsed by this Puritan judgment, in order that it may pass muster in the Christian world; and because this cannot be, are ready, at once, to cry out that all is wrong, and the Church in a crisis that loudly calls for reaction and reform. But what can be more preposterous, than to think of settling the controversy before us in any such lap-sided style as this? The one single difference now presented, that, namely, which regards the reception or rejection of the Creed, is enough, of itself, to destroy the weight of any judgment that Puritan denominations, or Puritan religious papers, may see fit to entertain here of the German Reformed Church; for the points at issue are, to a great extent, condi-

tioned and caused by this very difference itself. To what can it amount in such a case, to be told that such and such sect, or this and that "Recorder," "Observer," or "Intelligencer," dubbing one another evangelical, is not satisfied with our position? *Of course* they are not satisfied with it, refusing, as they do, to own the binding authority of the Apostles' Creed, which it has become with us a cardinal principle to assert. We do not wish their approval, in these circumstances; and we ought to have no patience, certainly, with those among ourselves, whose sense of what is due to the claims of the Creed is so tepid, that they can dream, for one moment, of referring the cause here at stake to the decision of any tribunal, where it is known that these claims are of no authority or weight. It is pitiful, truly, when the Lutheran Church, by its organ in Baltimore, is seen pleasing itself with the sympathy of New England Puritanism on some point that involves the complete abandonment of its own distinctive faith; as though this were a mere circumstance only, and *that* a matter, in some way, of primary account. The whole thing has in it the stench of hypocrisy and sham. And just so in the case before us, it should be considered a like solemn farce, to talk of sending the German Reformed Church to any such foreign quarter for the trial of her faith. There is treason, indeed, to her theological life in the very thought.

If those who oppose us, and make a noise about our Romanizing tendencies, could only be brought to acknowledge the Apostles' Creed in its true and right sense, and to set themselves earnestly to the use of it in their public and private services of religion, there would soon be an end of their difficulty. Let them try the experiment. *Then* we shall be ready to respect their judgment; but not before. Here is the hinge of our controversy. Is Christianity now what it was once held to be by this old Creed; or has it become something else? Shall we Romanize, as they term it, with the Creed; or shall we Puritanize, by charging it with contradiction to the Scriptures, and treating it as only the "fossil relic of by-gone ages?" Have we gone too far in our zeal for the authority of the ven-

erable symbol ; and is the German Reformed Church now prepared to take back any part of her testimony in its favor, or to give up one iota of its primitive signification, as a sop to Cerberus, or a tub to the whale ? Let the people answer. It has been said insultingly, that the body of the Church, the laity, are kept in the dark by their pastors and the "German Reformed Messenger," and have not sense enough to discern the imposition they are under ; and so the task of enlightening and alarming their blind security has been generously volunteered by the Baltimore "Observer" and the Dutch "Intelligencer" of New York. Do they need such teachers to comprehend this question concerning the Creed ? Will they follow them here as their guides ? We presume not.

#### THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

To bow to the authority of the Apostles' Creed, is of course at the same time to own as true for all ages its doctrine of the *Holy Catholic Church*. This article is not in the symbol by accident only ; neither is it open, as it stands there, to any and every construction. It proclaims, as every other article does, a supernatural fact, a mystery which men are to receive by faith, as something that flows with objective necessity from the resurrection and glorification of Christ. Faith in Christ's glorification, and in the consequent mission of the Holy Ghost, completes itself as faith in the institution and heavenly powers of the Church, and without this can never be more, it is to be feared, than a gnostic imagination or dream. There can be no doubt, but that the sense of this necessary relation has of late penetrated the general mind of the German Reformed Church with new force, in proportion precisely to the new interest she has been led to take in the Creed ; and it is equally clear, that the want of the same right sense and feeling on the part of other denominations, has served to create some very real matter of difference here again, in the general controversy which we have now under consideration. The issue, rightly apprehended, regards no shadow, but a most serious reality. It is attempted, indeed, as usual on the unchurchly side, to throw it into a false form ; as though the question regarded the



Church as a simply natural corporation, dissociated from Christ; in which case, it becomes easy to declaim nonsense about exalting one at the expense of the other. But just here, we may see what difference there is between the Puritan theory of the Church and the idea of it as presented in the Creed. What Puritanism thus allows itself to put asunder, the ancient faith joins in indissoluble connection. In the New Testament and Creed, Christ is the head, and the Church his body, with a reciprocity of relation that puts this modern mechanical conception to shame at every point. The Church here is no accident of Christianity merely, a thing tacked to it outwardly for conveniency and form; it belongs to its very essence and constitution, and enters accordingly as a necessary element into the general mystery of its revelation in the world. But all this Puritanism has no power to understand; and the article of the Creed on the subject is for it, accordingly, a decided tendency towards Rome. So with our Puritanizing sects generally. Lutheranism, as represented by the "Lutheran Observer," and the Low Dutch Church, as represented by the "Christian Intelligencer," have no faith whatever in the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church *as taught in the Creed*. When they pretend to accept it, they mean in fact something else altogether; something which is no mystery at all, and no object of faith but only of notion and fancy, something which does not involve, with any sort of necessity, the attributes of the true idea of the Church, but sets all these aside rather as in no way suitable to its pretensions and claims. What they mean by the Church is no Divine constitution, strictly speaking; no order of relations and powers above nature, starting on the day of Pentecost, and comprehending in itself the full force of the Christian salvation for the use of men to the end of time. The idea requires no unity, no catholicity, no apostolicity, no historical continuity, no real presence of the supernatural under any outward form. It finds no contradiction to itself in the sect system, carried out to any extent. That this low view of the Church should be joined with active hostility to all that enters into the true idea of it as this meets us in the

Creed, is only what might be naturally expected; and it is easy to understand, accordingly, how the German Reformed Church also, in proportion as she has been led to own here the authority of the truth, should have drawn opposition upon herself from the same quarter.

There is real matter of controversy, it is plain enough, in this whole case. An idea of the Church prevails on one side, which is rejected on the other. Let it be observed, however, that the German Reformed Church has not after all pretended to establish any positive determination of the nature of the Church, beyond the general statement of the Creed and the Heidelberg Catechism. It is not by proposing in form any particular view or scheme, and trying to make it of binding authority for the conscience of her membership, that she has provoked hostility and opposition; but simply by refusing to take such ground on the subject, as would involve an actual surrender of the entire mystery with which the controversy is concerned. The opposition demands, that such a low view of the Church shall be formally held as may effectually turn it into a mere human corporation, strip it of the attributes ascribed to it in the Creed, and make it the *legitimate* home of schisms and sects to any imaginable extent; and that it shall then be considered heresy, to argue or plead at all in favor of any higher view. The German Reformed Church replies: "We cannot do this; because we see and feel that the article of the Creed, and the plain sense of the Scriptures, require a great deal more than is comprehended in so low a scheme. How exactly the proper sense of the article is to be carried out, in the present circumstances of the Christian world, we are not prepared to say by any formal ecclesiastical act. We leave room here for difference of opinion, and invite free discussion. Let our Professors and others, proclaim their thoughts in an earnest way. We are not called upon, as a body, either to endorse or to condemn their particular views. We do not pretend even to call to any account, those among us who choose to rest in the low Puritan notion of the Church. It is against the genius of our communion, and against the growing tenden-

cy especially which is among us at this time. But if any fancy it, we leave them without persecution to their own bad taste." This is in fact the whole state of the case; which, however, is anything but satisfactory for those who have got it into their heads, that to make much of the Church in any way is to be unfriendly to the Bible and evangelical religion. The opposition before us, accordingly, renews its violent complaint. Nothing will please it, short of a full concession practically to its own unchurchly principle and standpoint, and an intolerant denunciation of all that may not agree with this as a departure to the same extent from Protestant orthodoxy. It is not content to be tolerated itself; there must be for it no toleration of others. It is not with this or that phase merely of the old Catholic mystery of the Church that it is disposed to quarrel; what it fights against in reality is the idea of the mystery in any and every form.

A simple and ready touchstone of Church feeling offers itself always in the judgment that is entertained of the sect system, as it now reigns in the Protestant world. In proportion as the sense of what is included in the true idea of the Church is obscure and dim, the sect system will give no offence; while the activity of a sound Church feeling, on the other hand, will be sure to make it appear as a wholesale abomination. So in the case before us, it will be found that the Puritanic interest, which is in controversy with the German Reformed Church, has no proper apprehension whatever of the necessary and universal contradiction there is between Christianity and such a reign of sects as we are now cursed with in its name. It is, at most, felt only to be a pity, that the Christian world should not be able to agree better in regard to the true sense of the Bible. But, after all, no opposition is seen in it to the conception of Christianity itself; nay, this is held rather to make full room for it, by the relation in which it is supposed to stand to the private judgment and free will of men. Sects are taken to be the normal and regular order of the Church; so far, at least, that they form no serious reproach to Protestantism as it now stands, and need not be expected to pass away before

it can be said to have fulfilled and made good its own mission. With our German Reformed Church, on the other hand, all such thinking is coming more and more to an end. Our sense of what Christianity is as a *Church*, our insight into the true import of the mystery we profess to receive in the Creed, has been so quickened, as to make it impossible for us generally to acquiesce in the notion, that it can ever have its full and final force in a system of sects. The most we can do, is to trust that such a system, as it now prevails, is not fatally at war with the very existence of Christianity, but capable of being reconciled with the idea of its presence for the time being, and as an interimistic transition merely to a better state of things in the future. To say that it is not a defect, a sore disorder; in one word, a very real and ugly disease, but a sign rather of promising health, in the constitution of Protestantism, is out of the question. It does violence to Christianity; for this involves the mystery of the Church, as Christ's body; and it is not possible to sunder the idea of the Church from its own inherent attributes ascribed to it in the Creed. We loathe and detest the sect system, therefore, as in principle opposed to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and feel bound to testify against it, and to seek its overthrow by doing what we can to assert in an earnest way the necessary claims of Christianity regarded as a Church. For in no other way can it be overthrown. The sect *principle* must give way before any end can be put to sects; and this principle can be subdued only by the Church principle; the one is just the negation of the other. To have faith and satisfaction in Christianity as a religion of sects, is to have no sense of what it is as a Church; and to have faith in it as the Holy Catholic Church, is to have no heart for it as a scheme of everlasting schisms and sects.

So much for the general question of the Church. It is easy enough to see, that there is very real matter of controversy here between the German Reformed Church and her opponents. We have no wish to conceal it. The clearer it can be made, the better. Puritanism asks us to abjure the article of the Holy Catholic Church as it has been held in all past ages, and

to accept Christianity as a religion of sects, the product of private judgment and private will. Are we prepared to come to that? Shall we be frightened into it by any system of terrorism from without; by the cry, The religious newspapers are against you, and the Puritanically minded sects from Dan to Beersheba; by the senseless clamor of Romanism and Puseyism, kept up by those who have no power to help their own bad cause in any other way! Time will show.

#### SACRAMENTAL GRACE.

This difference of view with regard to the nature of the Church, draws along with it necessarily a difference of view also with regard to the *ministry* and the *sacraments*.

Where the Church is looked upon mainly in the light of a human corporation, the office of the holy ministry must, as a matter of course, undergo a corresponding degradation. No earnestness then is made with the idea of a Divine commission or an apostolical succession. The real rights and powers of the office are regarded as proceeding from the people; and it is supposed to be magnified, by being reduced as much as possible to one and the same level with simply secular trusts under any other form. The German Reformed Church is not prepared to acquiesce in this poor view. Her sense of the supernatural constitution of Christianity involves of itself the sense also of a more than earthly force in the ministry. But as this has not been made the subject of any particular controversy, it needs at present no farther notice.

The question of the sacraments has been more prominent. As seals of the grace which is comprehended in the Church, they must necessarily have a character answerable to it; and as they are for our thinking, so also will this be by inevitable connection. Let the Church cease to be a mystery for our apprehension, and the mystery of the sacraments will also be at an end; we shall have in them the natural appendages only of an economy that belongs to nature. So if it be assumed on the other hand, that the sacraments include no grace, set no supernatural reality in contact with the worshipper, it will be in vain to dream still of a Church that is the bearer of heaven-

ly life in the sense of the Creed. How should the Church be more in this way for us than its own seals? The ancient faith saw in the sacraments accordingly, what it saw in the mystery of godliness they were given to represent. They were not signs only of something absent, but seals of something present, the visible exhibition of invisible grace. Baptism was for the remission of sins, and is acknowledged plainly enough in the Creed itself, under this character, as part of the mystery of faith. The Lord's Supper was a real participation of the body and blood of Christ, made to be present mystically, by the power of the Holy Ghost, under the elements of bread and wine, for the nourishment of his people to everlasting life. The substance of this old sacramental doctrine passed unhurt, we may say, through the shock of the Reformation; for the rationalistic view attributed to Zwingli gave way before the sounder sentiment of Calvin; and the Reformed Church united thus with the Lutheran, in declaring the sacraments to be the vehicles of the grace they represent, and in asserting especially the distinctive mystery of the blessed eucharist, as we find it proclaimed for instance in the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. But with that falling away of veneration for the Creed, and faith in the article of the Church, which as we have just seen has come to prevail among much of our modern Protestantism, this old doctrine of the sacraments has gradually gone more and more out of use; so that many of our sects now find it hard to form so much as a notion of its meaning, and as soon as it is set before them are ready to scout it from their presence as pure superstition and nonsense. In the German Reformed Church, on the other hand, there has come to prevail for some time past, the feeling that there is a deplorable error at work here among these unsacramental sects, which it is of the highest account for the interests of religion to oppose and withstand; and there may be said to be among us, accordingly, both ministers and people, a growing disposition to think and speak honorably of the sacraments, to look upon them as mysteries, and to ascribe to them a mystical supernatural force, such as they were held to

carry along with them in the times of Primitive Christianity and in the age of the Reformation.

Here of course is a very real issue, a most tangible case of controversy. Let the true form of it, however, be well kept in mind. The German Reformed Church has not enacted any new rule or definition on the subject; has never endorsed formally any particular statements of her Professors in regard to it; has brought in no test whatever in the case to disturb the most latitudinarian conscience. She has merely refused to accept the Puritanic theory of the sacraments as her own, and to give judgment against every higher view as unevangelical and unsafe. It is not what she has done ecclesiastically in the matter, but what she has declined doing, that has given offence. For with all its boasted pretensions to liberality and toleration, this Puritanic habit of thought is sure to show itself the most intolerant in the world, wherever it is brought into collision with its own true opposite, the practical acknowledgment of the Holy Catholic Church. The idea of what is called sacramental grace, considered as a supernatural virtue or force objectively at hand in the Christian mysteries, is something therefore which it finds itself unable to endure in any form or shape. It hates the whole conception, and it is ready to stigmatize it from first to last, as Popery and Puseyism. Hence its sore dissatisfaction with the German Reformed Church. As represented by Berg and Company, it sought in the first place to carry out this proscriptive spirit in the bosom of the Church itself; and now, having been foiled and defeated in that endeavor, it seeks to carry the same point by agitation and noise from the outside. It is not enough that the Church says: "We leave the matter free. We pronounce no sentence in favor of the *"Principle of Protestantism"* or of the *"Mytical Presence"*;" but neither will we give sentence against them; and still less are we prepared to succumb to the Puritan rationalistic doctrine of the sacraments, as the only and necessary type of Protestant orthodoxy. We see that this is both unhistorical and unscriptural, and that the case calls for a higher view, in which room may be offered for the exercise of



faith in the sense of the ancient Christian Creed. God forbid then, that we should tax our Professors with heresy, for trying to stem the tide of rationalism here, by re-asserting what was asserted by Luther and Calvin, as well as by all the Fathers of the Church a thousand years before. We bid them God-speed rather in their pious work. Still, as just said, we pass no ecclesiastical judgment for the present on any question or point. If any one among us choose to believe or preach Puritanism, in virtue of his foreign theological affinities, or for any other reason, we call him to no account; we put no bar in his way. Our wish is simply to leave the matter free." It is not enough for the opposition before us, we say, that the German Reformed Church should answer in this truly liberal and catholic way. Its demand is not for toleration, but for persecution. It can bear no Mordecai in the gate. "Cæsar aut nullus," all or nothing, is its watchword and motto. "There is no room here," it exclaims, "for indulgence or temporization. You must take the Puritan theory of the sacraments, and require all to subscribe to it; or else stand convicted of being unfriendly to Protestantism. To consider the sacraments mysteries at all, to allow to them as such any objective grace whatever, is unevangelical. For doing so, the Mercersburg Professors ought to be called to account and condemned; and because the German Reformed Church has not treated them in this way, but has shown sympathy rather with the general drift of their teaching and a disposition to protect them in the use of their earnest freedom, she herself stands fairly exposed to the charge of a Romanizing tendency. She is on the highway to Popery; her people are in danger of being delivered over, bound hand and foot without knowing it, to the arms of the Roman Catholic Church; and a bellowing crusade must be got up accordingly, among surrounding sects, for the purpose of bringing them to their senses."

Let it be noted also, that this intolerant agitation is led off by the "Lutheran Observer" and the "Christian Intelligencer," with open treachery on the part of both to their own denominational standards. The Augsburg Confession teaches

the mystery of the real presence in Luther's sense, and without it Lutheranism is turned into a horrible farce; the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism affirm the same mystery in Calvin's sense. As represented by the papers just named, however, the Lutheran and Low Dutch Churches are seen giving the authority of these symbolical books to the winds, and joining hands with the rankest Puritanism in a sort of insane outcry against the mystery of the sacraments in any and every view. All this too in the name of evangelical piety, and zeal for the faith once delivered to the saints! Strange piety truly, and orthodoxy of the very queerest sort.

Is it to be expected now that the German Reformed Church will suffer herself to be bullied out of her own historical position, and to become renegade to the faith of her fathers, by any onset of Puritanism carried forward under *such* auspices? We rather think not.

#### LITURGICAL FEELING.

There is a close connection between the sacramental feeling in religion and the *liturgical*; and the growth of this last in the German Reformed Church may be referred to also as another real matter of difference between her and those by whom she is opposed in this controversy, although it has not yet ever been made the subject of any particular animadversion or debate. A very marked progress has taken place in the mind of the Church on the question of liturgical worship, even within the last five years; and as this has been in an almost noiseless way, without discussion, it can be accounted for only on the ground that the Church feeling in general has been gaining strength among us and taking root more deeply in the heart of the people. For there is an inward connection undoubtedly between the sense of what is comprehended in the idea of the Church, and the use of a liturgy; just as there is an inward connection also between such sense of the Church and a veneration for church festivals; for which reason the Puritan habit of mind, which is constitutionally unchurchly and unsacramental, carries with it also a low opinion of liturgies and festival days, seeing in them only the relics and shreds

of what it holds to be Popish superstition. In full distinction from this, we have now a very active demand among us for a liturgy in the liturgical form, that shall not be the product simply of private reflection, but be made to embody in it the life and spirit of what the worship of Christ's Church has been in past ages, and in which congregations shall be brought to take part with their ministers in the public service of the sanctuary. The demand is not confined to any one section of the Church; but extends, as it would appear, to the whole body, the Western Synod here being of one mind entirely with the Synod of the East. And what is particularly noteworthy, even our domestic alarmists themselves seem to be carried along, to some extent, with the course of things in this direction, so as to fall in certain cases into strange contradiction with their own position. One who has been figuring most conspicuously among them of late, is a member of the committee which is now engaged in the preparation of our new liturgy, and professes to be cordially pleased, not merely with the general design, but with the plan also, which has been laid down for its execution, and with the execution itself, so far as this has already gone. And yet there is no movement among us probably that looks so decidedly in the very direction these alarmists affect to deprecate, or that is likely to reach farther, if it succeed, in fixing on the Church the character of a Romanizing tendency in the eyes of all Puritanically minded sects and denominations. Let but this liturgy be completed, and brought into general use, and there will be a full end at once of all right understanding between us and these unchurchly sects. It is a more serious matter in such view than any amount of mere theological discussion; for it looks to practice, in its most intimate relation with the heart and life of the Church. To be consistent then, those who have been trying to get up a "crisis" among us, on the score of our Church tendencies, ought by all means to take the bull by the horns just at this point; where there is something like real ecclesiastical action to lay hold of, an overt cause of complaint on which to try their reforming hand. Let them call for an arrest of this litur-

gical movement, as being of Jesuitical origin and most decidedly Romanizing purpose and aim ; and let them invoke the intervention of New England Puritanism, and its hybrid imitations in the Lutheran and Low Dutch Churches, to add weight to the remonstrance. There can be no question as to *their* feelings on the subject. They have no sympathy with worship under any such form, and can hardly be said to know even what a liturgy means. Its forms, however pregnant with the soul of devotion, can never be more to them at best than *nugæ tolerabiles*, simply endurable trifles. In the end, no doubt, the introduction of a true Church service in this form into the German Reformed Church, if the present movement should ever come to that, will be, in their estimation, quite as offensive a mark of our unevangelical tendency, as anything they now find fault with in our theology or practice at other points.

Must the German Reformed Church then cry *Peccavi* in this case also, and put a stop to the liturgical movement which is going forward within her communion, in order that she may keep on good terms with this Puritanic spirit, and prove herself fit company for it as it reigns throughout the wide and mighty Babel of our sects? Let the people answer.

#### HISTORY AND FALSE PROTESTANTISM.

The idea of the Church, as it is made an article of faith in the Apostles' Creed, involves of necessity again the conception of its perpetual continuance in the form of *history*. Such a real constitution of grace, springing from the resurrection and glorification of Christ, cannot fail. Where there is no sense, however, of the true nature of the Church, as a supernatural fact in the world, as with our sects generally, this necessity, as a matter of course, is not felt. For the sect consciousness universally, as such, Christianity is a doctrine simply or theory in men's minds, which they have it in their power at any time to draw for themselves from the Bible, and which needs, therefore, no other continuity of existence than what may be supposed to be comprehended in the preservation of this sacred volume from one age onward always to another. Hence the

familiar notion of a complete falling away of the visible historical body, known as the Church, from the institution it started with in the beginning; by which it is held to have become the seat and empire of Satan for more than a thousand years, leaving Christianity to take care of itself as it best could, all that dark and terrible time, among fanatical and heretical communities on the outside. The German Reformed Church now has expressed no judgment on the subject ecclesiastically; but she sees and feels unquestionably, with growing conviction, that Christianity regarded as a Church *must* be historical in some way, and that to deny it such character, is in fact to betray it into the hands of its enemies. Here then, of course, she stands in material disagreement with those religious bodies, which rest in the opposite view; and the difference is one, the practical bearings of which are soon found to extend very far. It involves the great question, What is the true principle of Protestantism? It conditions necessarily the universal construction of ecclesiastical history; the light in which the past is regarded, and as related to it, the signification which is felt to belong to the present. In this way, it includes at last the whole issue between Protestantism in its sound and proper form, and mere anti-popery fanaticism, making war upon the universal mystery of Christianity in its name.

Having no faith in the mystery of the Church as proclaimed in the Creed, and no sense thus of its continuously historical presence in the world, Puritanism finds it very easy to solve to its own satisfaction the problem of what is to be regarded as the right relation between Protestantism and the Christianity of earlier times. It starts with the supposition, as an axiom fixed and settled, that Protestantism is identical with the true sense of the Bible; sets this up then as the absolute measure of truth; brings all previous Christianity to it as a standard; accepts as good what may seem to agree with it; and without hesitation rejects all besides as false and wrong. In this way, because it was originally in the nature of the case a protest against Romanism, the relation between the two systems is made to be one of complete opposition. Protestant-

ism is conceived to be true simply as it is the contradiction of Romanism ; and this last is set down accordingly for pure falsehood, just because it is the object of such contradiction. The credit of the Reformation is not felt to require at all, that it should appear to flow legitimately from the life of what had been considered the Church before ; but rather, that it should have no connection with this life whatever. Protestantism must be held to turn Catholicism into a wholesale lie. What if the so called Church had existed before only under this form ? It shows simply that the so called Church was unworthy of the name, and represented in truth not the kingdom of Christ, but the cause of Anti-Christ. So far as the Church was concerned, in the character of an outward historical organization, Christianity must be taken to have proved a failure ; the gates of hell *had* prevailed against it for a time ; it was become the synagogue of Satan. True religion existed only in spite of it, in nooks and corners. And what if it be found that this state of things extended back of the Reformation for many centuries, away up through the Middle Ages, and it is not easy to say how much farther still ? It only shows then that the Church had been a synagogue of Satan all this time. To yield a thousand years here to the Devil, is no more difficult for the principle before us than it is to yield a hundred. But what if it appear, that the earliest ages of the Church, the fourth century, the third, the second, had a similar order of Christianity in many respects with that which prevailed in later times, and stubbornly refuse at least to come into any sort of general accord with Protestantism after this Puritan fashion and scheme ? Such a supposition may not be welcome to the theory in hand ; just the opposite of it will be pretended and taken for granted as long as it can be done ; but still here again, as before, the old conclusion offers itself always as a last resort. The Puritan scheme of Protestantism must be considered as at all events the absolute truth of Christianity, for it is derived directly from the Bible ; and *therefore*, if the Church of the second and third centuries *did* deviate from this in any material respect, the fault was plainly its own. It was the myste-

ry of iniquity already at work to obscure and destroy the mystery of godliness. From every such authority, we are told, it is our privilege and duty to appeal at once to the Bible. There we find Christianity in its most truly original and primitive form; and so long as we can be satisfied that we have this on our side, it is but of small account if the Church of all subsequent ages, from the second down to the sixteenth, do seem to be against us. Let the sixteenth century be true, we may say in this case, though every century besides be found a liar.

Now if there be any truth at all in Christianity, it is certain that this scheme of ecclesiastical history cannot stand, and that no defence of Protestantism can ever be firm and solid which rests on any such ground. It is against reason, against faith, against the Bible, and against facts; and the theological science of the age is fast bearing it away to its proper annihilation.

A vigorous effort has been made on the part of what is styled the Mercersburg theology, to vindicate the cause of Protestantism from the murderous hands of this unchurchly and unhistorical spirit, and to maintain, at the same time, the indefectibility of the Christian Church according to Christ's most plain and explicit promise, by insisting that the stream of Christianity lay through all previous ages, however turbid, in the Catholic Church, and that to be of any true authority and force, Protestantism must be regarded as strictly the continuation of it under a new and different form. Such a relation between the present and the past seems to involve necessarily the idea of what is called, in the broad sense, historical development, or the progressive unfolding of the original sense and substance of Christianity, supposed of course to be always the same, into new phases and forms of life. The premises of the case being what they are known to be in fact, namely, that the Church is a real constitution established by Christ in the world which can never fail, and that the Christianity of the first centuries was in many points materially different from that which is now known as Protestantism, a fact that no scholar pretends



to dispute, there would seem to be no other way certainly by which it is possible to assert rationally the credit of this last as a part of Christ's kingdom. Unless we can conceive of room in Christianity for some sort of legitimate growth and progress, it is vain to attempt the justification of Protestantism; for on the one hand it is not what this was immediately after the age of the Apostles, and on the other hand it must be joined with that first life of the Church notwithstanding by true historical derivation to be of any force.

With all this, however, the reigning anti-popery spirit has been greatly dissatisfied; just because any view of the sort requires necessarily a different notion of the Catholic Church, from that which this fanatical temper has come to regard as a part of the Bible and an essential element of evangelical religion. Protestantism being for it the sheer negation of Catholicism, it holds the last for an abomination wherever it may come in its way, hates it, and makes a pious merit of abusing and blaspheming everything that enters distinctively into its constitution. It has its special scheme of Biblical exegesis, accordingly, answerable to this view; in particular a few pet texts about Anti-Christ and the Man of Sin, which it applies directly to the Pope and the Roman Church, requiring all men then to bow to this *interpretation* as the authority of the Bible itself. And so it must have next, of course, its special scheme of Church History, also, based on the assumption of a total apostacy on the part of the Church, starting no one can say how soon after the time of Christ, involving a grand jubilee of Satan throughout the Middle Ages, and brought to an end partially by the Reformation of the sixteenth century; which same scheme of history again, in virtue especially of the exegetical theory, just noticed, is taken to be in like manner of Biblical authority in some way, and so a necessary part of all sound Protestant orthodoxy. No wonder that the Mercersburg way of thinking should prove offensive to such a theological habit as this. It was construed at once into an insidious assault on the foundations of Protestantism; as though these must necessarily give way, unless both exegesis and history were forced

to bend to the narrow hypothesis here proposed for their use—and this too, in the face of all the most solid learning of the age. So in the cry raised years ago by Berg and Helffenstein against Schaff's *Principle of Protestantism*; and so also on the part of the opposition since got up on the outside of the Church to the Mercersburg system in general. Sufficient reason is supposed to be found for its condemnation in the simple fact that it refuses to fall in with the common anti-popery way of interpreting the Bible and constructing Church History; and the Synod of the German Reformed Church is bound, for this reason alone, it is pretended, to call it to account and pass censure upon it as something dangerous and wrong. And because the Synod has not seen proper to do this, it is now openly charged with being itself under the power of a Romanizing tendency and unfriendly at heart to the interests of Protestantism.

For all in truth that the Synod has done in the case thus far, has been to refuse yielding itself to the views of this narrow-minded school, and to declare itself content that its Professors, in common with all the best theological science of the age, should construe History and the Bible in a different way. This was precisely the question presented and acted upon at the meeting in Lancaster, in the fall of 1851, when the vote was taken with regard to Dr. Schaff's call to Philadelphia, solemnly expressing the almost universal wish of the body that he should continue his services in the Theological Seminary; the same vote on which so much stress has been laid since, by the spies of the Dutch Church, then present as delegates, to bear themselves out in their subsequent hostile report. The Professor had given offence to a certain class of American Protestants, by refusing to echo their familiar slang about the beast, the whore of Babylon, the man of sin, &c., as being the very sense of the Bible itself applied to the Church of Rome; by adopting, in common with Neander and the universal learning of Germany, a theory of Church History that explodes their favorite hobby of a total satanic apostacy, reaching through more than a thousand years; and as a consequence of

all this, by entertaining a more respectful opinion of the Catholic Church both as it was before the Reformation and as it has been since, than they were at all prepared to endure or digest—inasmuch as it had become with them a point of fond and pleasant orthodoxy, that the Catholic Church was no Church whatever, but a “synagogue of Satan” only and the “masterpiece of the Devil.” For this offence, they wished to have him silenced. The question before the Synod then, was *not*, whether the theological and historical views of the Professor in detail were to be sanctioned or not; but, whether the German Reformed Church saw fit to allow him the freedom he claimed in his studies, and was satisfied with the general drift and plan of his teaching, or would insist rather on having him bound to the Procrustes’ bed prepared for him by his enemies; whether in calling him from Europe to teach Church History in particular, she meant that he should be at liberty to go with the science of the age, and to take facts as he might find them to be, or intended only that he should do so as far as the limits of this anti-popery tradition would permit. This was the question; and a very important one it was, as all may readily see. How the Synod answered it is generally known.

It came to this: “We will not identify the cause of Protestantism with this anti-popery exegesis, or this anti-popery scheme of ecclesiastical history. If any choose to hold the Pope for St. Paul’s Man of Sin, or for the Anti-Christ of St. John; if any fancy the notion of a Devil’s millenium in the name of Christianity and the Church, extending from the sixth century to the sixteenth; if any think it necessary to hate and curse Catholicism, as a system that is evil only without any mixture of good, in proof of their own evangelical piety; we intermeddle not with their freedom, but willingly leave them to their own taste.\* On the other hand, however, they must not re-

\* Of this tolerant disposition, full proof has been given all along; and it was put to very clear test certainly, when the Rev. Dr. Mesick, of Harrisburg, allowed himself to harrangue first the Western and then the Eastern Synod, as he is said to have done at their last meetings, in a regularly built anti-popery sermon, trying his best to make it out that the Pope was Antichrist, and that to believe this is to be considered a necessary part of the orthodoxy of the German Reformed Church. It was generally felt, that the sermon was

quire us to make their prejudices the law of orthodoxy in the German Reformed Church. We are not called upon to issue a Biblical Commentary or a text book of Church History under the *imprimatur* of the Synod, nor to endorse in detail the published views of our Professors; but we see no reason for requiring them to abandon *their* view of the Bible and of the past history of the Church, in favor of this anti-popery tradition. Nay, we wish them not to do so, but to adhere rather to their own general plan and method, as being in our estimation altogether better than any such narrow mechanical scheme. Should their teaching run counter to the Heidelberg Catechism, or to the Apostles' Creed, we are prepared of course to call them to account. But it will be time enough to do this, when the fact is charged and proved in some properly responsible way."

Such was the position taken by the Synod two years ago. It defined nothing ecclesiastically, and settled nothing, as to the positive force of any text in the Bible or any fact in Church History. It was simply a refusal to do this in favor of a particular theological interest; which, not content with being tolerated in its own exegetical and historical notions, was fanatically set on making them of obligation also, on pain of heresy, for the whole Protestant world. This, however, amounted in fact to a serious matter, over against the actual position of those religious bodies, which had already surrendered themselves, either in whole or in part, to the power of that other intolerant scheme; and it has much to do now, as is plain enough to be seen, with the crusade and would-be crisis, which

very much out of character and good taste; but who dreamed of taking the author of it to task for his freedom, or who felt that it showed any real bravery whatever, to exercise it in this bravado way? How very indulgent the Church has always shown itself towards Dr. Berg, not simply enduring his unhistorical radicalism as a private hobby, but allowing him to do all he could besides to inoculate others with the same virus, and even bearing in him for years a license which set at defiance the authority of the Church itself, and openly tended towards its dissolution—all this is something too fresh in memory still, to need any special mention in this place. The same general observation may be applied also to the case of the Rev. Jacob Helffenstein. The relation between these would-be martyrs and the Synod of the German Reformed Church, has been one throughout of insulting persecution on their part, and of most patient forbearance only on the part of the Church.

some among them have been trying to get up for our special benefit at the present time. The spirit which actuates the movement, whether in the Dutch Church or in the Pseudo-Lutheran, could be easily enough propitiated, if only our Synod would vote Roman Catholic baptism invalid, ring a few changes lustily on the familiar nick-names of Popery, take up the ribald song piped for it by such men as Brownlee and Berg, adopt the anti-popery key of the prophecies, fall in with the "grand apostasy" scheme of Church History, or stultify itself in any other way by turning Catholicism into a wholesale lie, for the purpose of making Protestantism, nay, modern Puritanism rather in its most unchurchly and unsacramental form, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, of all that real Christianity has ever been in the world. With this preliminary bond of fellowship, which might seem to be for many of our sects the only conception they have of the "communion of saints," it is wonderful indeed how latitudinarian they can afford to be with their liberality, when occasion may require, at other points. These are the main terms of their charity and favor. Are we ready to purchase the boon at any such price?

#### ARTICLES ON EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

Much umbrage has been taken especially with the historical articles of the "Mercersburg Review," which have been charged with countenancing directly the worst superstitions, as they are commonly considered, of the Church of Rome, and making concessions to it that must prove fatal to the cause of Protestantism altogether.

In these articles the ground is taken, that the Christianity of the first centuries, leaving out of question the age of the Apostles, was not of one form with modern Protestantism, but carried in it rather from the start the germs at least of the same system which was known afterwards as the Catholic, from the sixth century down to the sixteenth. The same general view we meet with in Isaac Taylor's work, entitled, "Ancient Christianity," the object of which is particularly to discredit the use made of the Nicene Period by the Tractarian party in

the Church of England, by showing that this period was itself fully involved in what are considered the worst errors of Romanism as established in later times. So much indeed is commonly admitted as regards the fourth and fifth centuries, by all Puritan controversialists, when their business is to fight Prelacy and Popery; however they may not hesitate, at times again, with strange inconsistency, to praise and quote the learned and pious fathers of the same period, as though they really supposed them to be somehow after all of one mind theologically with themselves. Little difficulty moreover has been made generally in the same quarter with the credit even of the third century, when it has appeared necessary to give it up for the sake of a favorite preconception. The age of Cyprian, we are then told, was already deep in the same system, which swamped the whole Christian world so completely in the next period. With this concession, Puritanism would fain be allowed to stop. But the case itself knows no such limit. By examining the documents of the second century, we find the system of the third again early at work in its controlling aims and principles at least, if not in all its details, away back to the days of Polycarp and Ignatius. This has been faithfully brought into view by the "Mercersburg Review," in the articles entitled *Early Christianity* and *Cyprian*. The object of the discussion was partly, the mere historical representation for its own sake, as having to do with facts of more than usual interest not generally well understood; and partly to show the necessity of adopting and openly professing some construction of Protestantism, that may be in real harmony with these facts. In what has consisted then the offence of the articles? It is not easy to say precisely; for it would appear to float between two occasions of dissatisfaction, which by no means agree well logically with one another. Sometimes a show is made of disputing the historical facts, as though the credit of Puritanism needed antiquity on its side, and must be wounded by any representation showing that this is not the case; and then again, almost it may be in the next breath, the displeasure is simply that the facts, let them be what they may, should be treated as

of any sort of account, in a case which this same Puritanism has already settled in favor of itself, by appealing from all other antiquity to the age of the Apostles as construed to its own modern taste out of the Holy Scriptures. Had the Review pandered to either of these presumptions, by hiding or twisting facts so as to make history what the case needs, or else by denouncing them heartily as palpable corruptions of Bible truth; or better still, perhaps, had it played sycophant to both presumptions at once, distorting in one direction and denouncing in another; all would have been well, and the investigation might have proceeded with as much freedom as it pleased. The offence lay in this, that facts were allowed to speak for themselves, without being presented at every point through the refracting and discoloring medium of a theory created for the very purpose of placing them in an unfavorable light, and that a disposition was shown to treat them with respect rather than reproach in their own proper shape and form.

The whole case is plain enough. The Christianity of the second, third, and fourth centuries, we say, was progressively of the same general order, throughout the entire Christian world, and in this character it differed altogether from modern Protestantism, and led fairly and directly towards the Roman Catholic system of the Middle Ages. In proof of this simply historical assertion, we point to facts. It is purely a question of history in the first place, to be either granted or denied as the truth of facts may seem to require. Is the general proposition true as a historical fact, or is it not? If not, let this be shown by proper evidence. But if it be true, what then? Must it be ignored or overlooked? No honest Protestant certainly will say that. We are bound to look it firmly in the face; and when the question is then asked, *How is this fact to be construed over against the claims of Protestantism?* It should be felt to be one that is entitled to some open and manly answer. There are now but two general ways, in which to dispose of the matter consistently with these claims. We may treat the Church of the first ages, after the time of the Apostles



tles, as a wholesale falsification of Christianity in its proper Apostolical form, and so make the truth of Protestantism to consist in its being a new edition altogether of what was then so short-lived in the beginning; or we may allow a true continuation of the primitive life of Christianity in the early Church, according to the article in the Creed, and make Protestantism then to agree with it in some way of historical derivation, answerable to the law of growth in the natural world, by which all differences shall be resolved into outward accident and form merely, whilst the inward substance is taken to be always the same. One or the other of these methods we must adopt for the solution of the question in hand, or else fall into down right obscurantism of the most pitiful sort. The first method, however, is only another name for infidelity, denying as it does practically, the existence of the Church and the authority of the Creed. The case then shuts the cause of Protestantism up to the other view, as the only one by which its pretensions can be consistently maintained without treason to Christianity. This is the general conclusion of our argument, in the articles of the "Mercersburg Review" on the Early Church. The argument itself proposes no particular theory or scheme, for the construction of such a historical genesis as the case is shown to demand. It merely urges the necessity of some scheme of the sort, if Protestantism is to be upheld at all. That, however, is at once much. It implies, in the first place, a true succession of Christianity in the Catholic Church, in spite of all corruptions, not only from the first century to the sixth, but from the sixth century also to the sixteenth. This makes the Church an object of respect through all ages. And in the second place, it requires, that Protestantism shall not be taken to be such a rupture with the Catholic Church, as excludes the idea of a strictly historical continuity of being between what Christianity is now in the one form and what it was before in the other. When it comes to such wholesale negation and contradiction, the true idea of Protestantism is gone, and we have only unhistorical radicalism in its place. Protestantism *must* be historical, to be true. To say that it is not

the continuation of the previous life of the Church, of one substance though not of one form with what this was in all past ages, is at once to pronounce it antichristian and false.

But in any case, what has the orthodoxy of the German Reformed Church, as such, to do with these articles of the "*Mercersburg Review*?" The Synod has never made itself responsible in any way for all that might appear in this publication; and has never been called upon, so far as we know, to express any opinion upon the particular historical discussions which are here in question.\* Most probably this could not be done with any sort of unanimity. All that has had place thus far, is, that the discussion has been allowed to take its free course. This, in the circumstances, is indeed much; more, it seems, than many noisy advocates of free inquiry and free speech consider right; more a great deal, no doubt, than suits the humor of many of our affectedly liberal and independent sects; more in particular by far than could be made to square at all with the genius of the Reformed Dutch Church. But the German Reformed Church has now, and always has had, a very different genius.

#### CONCLUSION.

Altogether then as it appears, the controversy between the German Reformed Church and her Puritanic opponents involves very real issues of the highest significance and moment, which show it to be anything but an empty battle of words. Underneath all the sophistical pretences that are put forward

---

\* Who thinks of holding the Presbyterian Church responsible, for all the views that appear in the Princeton "*Repertory*?" A succession of articles has been given to the world there lately on the Church Question, which, notwithstanding the most respectable paternity to which they are ascribed, we should be sorry indeed to regard as a fair exposition of the faith of Presbyterianism, or of its want of faith rather, on this important subject. We are glad to see too, that from within the denomination itself a disposition is shown to demur and protest against the doctrine of the articles, as being in truth subversive of the idea of the Church altogether. But no one feels it necessary, we presume, that the General Assembly should pass judgment in form on the Princeton publication, in order to "define its own position;" and the Dutch Church in particular would hardly think of breaking fellowship with that body for not doing so—even if the predilections of Young Amsterdam were not but too well satisfied, as they probably are, by the exceedingly low ground the "*Repertory*" has seen proper to take.

to conceal or caricature the true points at stake, lies the felt presence and force of the most interestingly solemn question that is before the Christian world at the present time. It is emphatically the question of questions for the whole cause of Protestantism; that which rests at the foundation, we may say, of its universal controversy with the Roman Catholic Church, and includes thus the validity of the very title or charter by which it claims the right of existing and being known as a part of true Christianity in the world. Is Protestantism built upon the only true sense of the Bible as we find this primarily settled in the Apostles' Creed, and in the faith of the universal Primitive Church? Can it assert in its own favor steadily the attributes of the Christian Church, as described in the Creed, one, holy, catholic, and historical, by showing in its constitution a continual want and endeavor at least after their full actualization? The Catholic Church of course maintains the negative, and sees in it the sure prognostic of dissolution for the whole interest. Our reigning sect system is disposed for the most part to acquiesce in the same denial, seeing in it, however, what it considers the glory of Protestantism and the best pledge of its prosperity in time to come. The idea of the Holy Catholic Church, we are told by it, is a mere superstitious "figment," having no necessary relation whatever to true Christianity; the notion of an apostolical ministry and of sacramental grace is absolutely unevangelical; we care for no history, and we want no unity; any sect, starting up anywhere and at any time, with the Bible in its hand, may have at once all the powers and prerogatives of Christ's kingdom, to a greater extent than they were ever possessed by the so-called Catholic Church of the Middle Ages. Should this extreme Puritanical view succeed, as it threatens to do, in making itself the only true sense of Protestantism, the cause will be changed into another thing altogether from what it pretended to be in the beginning; it will be clearly the negation of what has been considered Christianity in all past ages; and it is easy enough to see, how in these circumstances it must run itself out finally into sheer infidelity, justifying in

full the worst presages of the Roman Catholic Church. The grand question of the present time is then : Shall this Puritanic theory of Protestantism be allowed to prevail, and the scheme on which it pretended to start in the sixteenth century, be given up as one shown now by the course of events, to be hopeless and false ? Who will say that this is not a great and terribly solemn question ? It forms in truth the *Thermopylae* of the whole Catholic controversy. This surrendered, all is lost. And now right in the midst of the critical pass, and at this time pre-eminent among its defenders, appears the small band of our German Reformed Church heroically contending for the original principles and maxims of the Reformation. She does not pretend to settle positively the form in which the claims of the Church question are to be set in harmony with the cause of Protestantism ; but she feels the claims themselves to be real, and cannot consent to have the Gordian knot of their adjustment hewn asunder by the rationalistic axe of a scepticism, which seeks to destroy both Church and Creed together with one and the same blow. She is not prepared yet to yield the point to Romanism, as so many sects around her seem ready to do, that Protestantism is constitutionally unchurchly ; that it runs necessarily into Puritanism ; that it *must* sooner or later break with the Creed, turn the sacraments into mere signs, resolve the idea of the Church into a figment or phantom, and renounce all part and lot in its past history. Very real, we say, in such view, is the matter of difference between her and the opposition which has arrayed itself against her in the present crusade ; and most important it is, not only for her own sake but for the interest also of Protestantism in general, that she should continue steadfast and immoveable in her position, "nothing terrified by her adversaries," and faithful always to her trust. Should she fail to do so, by giving way to the anti-popery tide, it would be indeed a sad calamity for Protestantism ; for it would amount to the most humiliating practical confession, that this is in its essential nature at war with all that is comprised in the idea of the Church as it is made an article of faith by the ancient Creeds,

and that no effectual stand can be made within its bosom against the desolating flood of Puritanism under its most unchurchly form. When the Catholic controversy shall have come to this all round, it will be in truth fairly at an end. Protestantism, without faith in the sacraments, and in no historical union with the mystery of the Church, will soon be found another name only for universal unbelief.

The general position of the German Reformed Church, then, in the midst of the downward tendencies that surround her on all sides, speaks clearly enough for itself; and the significance of it is amply attested by the power of provocation it carries in it for the unchurchly and rationalistic spirit generally of the times. To stigmatize it as *Romanizing* means nothing. It is so, of course, for all who have no faith in the Creed, and for whom its article of the Church is only an empty figment. But it leads necessarily over to Romanism, we are told, and offers no ground to stand upon short of this system. The more pity if it be so, we reply, for Protestantism. For only see, to what the assumption amounts. It is not simply, that the views of her Professors on the Creed, the Church, the Sacraments, the relation of Protestantism historically to Catholicism, offer no secure standing-place for Protestant faith; but that the German Reformed Church, by merely suffering such views and owning the force of the principles on which they rest, though without pledging herself formally to them in any way, has virtually placed herself on like untenable ground. No position is safe for Protestantism, according to this view, which so much as tolerates any disposition or endeavor to set it in harmony with the claims of the Creed and of Christian antiquity, or to clothe it with a truly historical character in its relations to the Catholic Church. Alas, we say again, for the whole interest, if this be in truth the predicament in which it stands. Then the only tenable ground for it to occupy must be, not even the bald, bleak profession of the unsacramental Baptists, but the unbelieving platform of Unitarianism itself. As a body, certainly, the German Reformed Church has no difficulty whatever in maintaining her full Protestant consciousness; nor is she

likely to be smuggled soon into Popery, as some hypocritically affect to fear, without her own knowledge and consent.

It is said, however, that the general system here in consideration is likely to carry some actually over to the Catholic Church; and any such result, it is pretended, must convict it of being essentially at variance with Protestant principles. But this does not follow necessarily by any means. Suppose a conversion of such sort. It would be of no force as regards the system, unless it were found to flow with necessary logic from its premises. It is certain, too, that if any one should become a Catholic in this way, it would have to be in the end by giving up, not merely the general position of the German Reformed Church, but the whole so-called Mercersburg theology also, as being in reality Protestant only and not Catholic. The conversion would hinge on the abandonment of this standpoint, not as one less secure, but as one felt to be more secure and promising a great deal, than any other which Protestantism is able to offer. The possibility of such a conversion may be admitted, without any difficulty; and in this respect it may be allowed also, that the general position now in view is more exposed to it than any less churchly and less historical scheme of thinking; just because it forms in truth the last and strongest resort of all rational trust in Protestantism, so that to despair of this is necessarily to despair of the universal interest at the same time. No thoughtful and earnestly serious mind, having become awakened to the issues which are here at stake, and having them fully in view, can think of taking refuge from their claims in any order of thought which involves and requires a full rupture with the Creed and all that the mystery of Christianity has been taken to be in past ages. In such circumstances, to lose confidence in the historical and churchly character of Protestantism, to feel that it is hopelessly at war with the Christian life of previous ages, to be forced to the conclusion that no construction can show it to be derived from this in the way of organic and legitimate progress, must be indeed as a matter of course to bow to the claims of the Catholic Church. The alternative would be felt as being either

that or infidelity. But supposing such a case, what then? How could it affect at all the credit of the general position itself which might thus be given up in despair, any farther than it would be of such force against the cause of Protestantism as a whole. To all whose confidence in this remained unshaken, there could be no reason why it should not be defended and maintained from the churchly and historical position still, as well as from any other. Nay, it would continue just as certain as before, that if it is to be upheld at all, it can be on this ground only, and on no other; as here alone is to be found any show of real and sure *terra firma* for Protestant faith, as distinguished from Protestant unbelief. Whatever may come of this, there is no better or more available position certainly on which to fall back in its rear. On no other hypothesis, is it possible for an intelligent Protestantism, which still clings to the mysteries of the Christian faith as this stood in the beginning, to find any true rest for the sole of its foot. To say that the cause cannot stand here, is simply to say that it cannot stand anywhere; and to admit in fact, if not in so many words, that to keep out of the Catholic Church we must cast ourselves headlong into the cold embrace of infidelity. God forbid, that *we* should ever be willing to do that.

Nor need it be feared on the part of the German Reformed Church, that she will not be able to maintain herself in the general position she has taken, over against the noise and tumult of her enemies. If only she continue true to herself, calm, firm, united and resolute, in the prosecution of her own quiet course, as to a truly wonderful extent has been the case thus far, she has nothing to fear. The only hope of this late Dutch crusade has been, that its agitation might lead to serious strife and division in the Church itself. Having failed in that bad purpose, its impotency serves now but to show the inward force and power of the cause which it has been attempted to overthrow in such insidious style. It is much indeed, simply to have met this heavy onset from abroad without harm. The Church by means of it, knows herself better, and is stronger than before. It has become more plain than ever that she



feels and understands the true nature of her position, and is not to be forced out of it by foreign interference in any form. It may as well be understood all round; the German Reformed Church is neither Puritan, nor American Lutheran, nor American Dutch, and has no mind to become anything of the sort at present, but much mind rather to follow what she takes to be the truth in a different and more "excellent way." Her bent as a denomination, in this respect, is fixed. Revolution for her now here, would be as the collapse of death. The law of her prosperity within, and her whole significance without, are alike staked upon the constancy with which she may adhere to her own course. In this lies her only real strength; shorn of which, she must soon be known as one of the poorest and weakest among sects.

J. W. N.

Mercersburg, Pa.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE TRUE RELATION OF CHEMISTRY TO PHYSIOLOGY.

THE progress of science, in modern times, has been such as to astonish every one viewing it from a stand-point outside of itself, while those actively engaged in effecting this progressive movement, seem hardly aware of the great discoveries which attend their daily labors. If an argument were needed to prove the progressive character of the human mind,—an idea which indeed is implanted in that mind by the Creator and dimly foreshadowed in the law which provides for the development of all organic creation from the germ to full maturity,—if such an argument be needed, the wonderful progress of science would go far to supply the deficiency. The law of progress applies to all creation: with the animal it perishes with the death of the individual; with man it does not die, in two senses,—in the one, it continues in another world, (so far as the immortal part is concerned) though, with more rapidity,

hastening on to the attainment of greater and still greater good, or greater and still greater ill;—in the other, it lives on earth in the works he leaves behind him, the character of which depends greatly on the age in which he has lived and whose wants have called forth the relative faculties of mind necessary to minister effectually to them.

The wants of any particular age thus give direction to the mental labors of its great men, and as these are theoretical or practical, warlike or pacific, we find that the great works peculiar to the age are philosophical or practical, abounding in refinements of the art of war, or in the more harmonious and peaceful evidences of philanthropy. With all this, however, it seems that, in the course of humanity on earth, there has been predominant since its very beginning an onward tendency towards a fuller development of its faculties and the productions of those fruits of mind, which afford perennial evidence of the greatness of its Creator. This onward tendency may seem at times to be retarded in various ways, and retrogression rather than progression to take place. During such intervals, strength is gained, which pushes on then with a vigor much increased by the delay. The progress has been not unaptly compared to that of a spiral where the curve, it is true, seems to return to the point from whence it started, but in fact is all the while advancing onward from that point.

Now in the spiral-progressive development of the human mind, different divisions of human knowledge, at different periods of time, seem almost exclusively to claim the attention of the race. This predominance does not take place blindly, but in obedience also to regular laws, which require that certain points should be fully elucidated before we are prepared for the attentive and serious consideration of others. There is thus a logical order, which marks the course of human investigation, not only in each particular individual, but in mankind as a whole,—an order, which is carried out most beautifully in the history of the attainment of knowledge, and which, when violated, results in the production of baseless theories and crude opinions, to be overturned by the more thorough inves-

tigations of after days. We see a practical exemplification of this, in the results attained by the Alchemy of the Middle Ages, when the attention of a few was turned to the cultivation of science, before the necessary preparation had been made for its proper study. But it must also be remarked that even a violation of such a logical order, though not resulting in the formation of *theories* likely to stand, yet it affords much that may be used when the proper time arrives for the investigation of these theories. Thus the results of these alchemical investigations have not all stood the stern tests of time, but many truths have been derived from them, and when incorporated with the knowledge of after times, they have greatly aided in the formation of more perfect theories.

The course of preparation, prior to the nineteenth century, prepared the way for the more thorough investigation of the arcana of science; and with the way thus laid open for this purpose, the student has attained a knowledge altogether peculiar to his own day, and made the century pre-eminent for the investigation of nature and her laws. That such pre-eminence has resulted *from* a utilitarian tendency of the race can hardly be said with justice, since the two are rather coincident than occupying the relation of cause and effect. We should rather say, in the development of human knowledge it had become necessary that such investigations should take place, since the domain of pure thought, cultivated for centuries, and the polemics of medieval theology and philosophy studied fully in their ever-varying aspect,—had enlarged man's views of himself and the world around him, and compelled him, after he had followed the mental and spiritual interpretation of the oracular *Γνωθι σεαυτόν*, to turn attention to its physical meaning,—to study the mysteries of his own organism and that of other beings likewise endowed with life,—the world in which he lived and the laws which govern it.

Such studies were, at first, mere gropings in the dark without one glimmer of light to direct his path. As time progressed, facts, isolated it is true, but nevertheless facts, were apprehended and a position assigned them in the store-house of

memory, until at length the lamp of truth lighting up his path, he found these facts evidences of the existence of laws, and the harmonious proportions of system were given to the results of his labors. Physiology, and physical science, with its various subdivisions, gradually acquired the dignity of sciences. They have since been enriched by the labors of thousands toiling with a sincere desire to enlarge the boundaries of knowledge.

These two divisions of knowledge are of the greatest utility to each other,—so great indeed as effectually to prevent a knowledge of the one, where there is entire ignorance of the other. They are mutually explanatory. The physical sciences require a knowledge of physiology to aid to any conclusion as to the forms, matter is found to possess in organic structure, and the Physiologist labors in vain if he is not possessed of a certain amount of knowledge which the physical sciences can give him.

In every living being, must be recognized the consummate wisdom of the Creator, who has seen fit to ordain a certain harmonious adaptation of means to ends; and since this adaptation presents itself with unerring accuracy in each species, we have styled it law,—that is an expression of His will with regard to that particular species. In the words of an English physiologist:\* “These laws are framed by man as expressions or descriptions of the slight glimpses he possesses of the *plan* according to which the Creator sees fit to operate in the natural world. Thus understood, the use of the term law can be, in no way, supposed to imply, that the Deity stands in any other relation to the phenomena of the universe than as their direct and constantly operating cause.”

In man, both mentally and physically, there seems to be a concentration of all the wonders of creation, which the ancient philosopher, though far too ignorant to understand, considered of so much importance that he called him a Microcosm moving in the Macrocosm,—a little world, embodying all the wonders and mysteries of the great world around him. With this little world, in its physical relations, the science of physiology is

\* Carpenter's *Introduc. to Hum. Phys.*

concerned. In the explanation of the mysterious functions of life, it brings to its aid the knowledge of sciences that are purely physical in their character, receiving from none more assistance in casting light on these functions than from the science of chemistry. Since, however, the exact relation of chemistry is too often misunderstood, it is proposed as a subject not only interesting in its general nature, but as involving consequences of importance to our religious belief, to devote a few pages to the consideration of the *true relation which Chemistry holds to Physiology.*

Physiology, treating of the phenomena peculiar to life, in its widest sense, comprehends a description of the organs through which these phenomena are manifested,—that is, includes anatomy. Since these phenomena take place in accordance with certain laws, which are equally recognized in mechanics and in living beings, it has been the custom to attempt an explanation of all vital operations by pure mechanical rules. Acting on such premises man has been compared to a machine ; and not only have poets labored to depict the excellencies of this machine, the harmonious adaptation of all its parts, and the transcendent accuracy with which its operations are carried on,—but the scientific man, forgetting all that is mysterious and wonderful in the structure of the human frame, and hence, necessarily, all that is peculiar to it as the habitation of the soul—the direct impress of its Creator,—has too often studied it as a mere machine, with a vital principle that he has improperly considered as of no more account than the main spring of a watch, or the steam generator of an engine. Such a view, however, of his wonderful habitation, so mysteriously connected with the animating principle which controls it for awhile and leaves it to decay and become loathsome to its brethren,—at one moment striving against all the destructive tendencies of nature, and at another yielding to them, and suffering all its parts to mingle with the common earth,—such a view, we say, is too low, paltry and insignificant for any but superficial observers of nature to adopt.

When chemistry began to shed some light on certain of the

operations, which take place within the recesses of the body,—the figure changed, and though not much used in poetry under its new form, (since poetry eschews with hearty good-will all reference to mortars and retorts, alembics, beaker glasses, and the other paraphernalia of the chemist's laboratory,) yet, as science had aided the physiologist to explain some of the workings of the body, with enthusiastic acknowledgments, he was ready to adopt chemistry as the interpreter of all its mysteries, and it is now compared to a laboratory. The figure was more rational than the preceding one, since certain actions of life can be *imitated* out of the body if organic matter be used for the purpose, and we can thereby bring explanation to clear up mystery, and to serve as a light to guide us in after examination. But nothing is surer than that these chemical operations in the system, are continually held in check by a vital force. Indeed they may almost be considered as the destructive agencies of life, which are forever warring against its integrity, rather than the preservative agencies which build up and bind together its various parts. Again, vital actions, even when most chemical, vary either in kind or degree, from those exhibited in the laboratory, as well as in the time required for their performance. As an illustration of this, may be quoted, "The shortness of the time in which the aliment becomes acid in depraved digestion,—a series of changes being produced in a few hours, which would require in the laboratory as many weeks," and in cases of disease, "where the functions of the stomach are nearly suspended, whatever is introduced into it remains unchanged and even the nutritious mucilages are not digested."\*

Fully aware of the folly of such comparisons, and not only folly, but the danger, since they induced men to build up theories on mere visionary notions, which theories impeded the progress of rational medicine by fencing it in with the whims and caprices of their authors, William Hunter is said to have spoken to his class, on one occasion, as follows: "Gentlemen, some physiologists will have it that the stomach is a mill, others that it is a fermenting vat, others again, that it is a stew-

---

\* Paris' Pharmacologia, 56.

pan,—but in my view of the matter, it is neither a mill, a fermenting vat, nor a stew-pan, but a *stomach*, Gentlemen, a *STOMACH*."

The danger, however, does not rest in the probability that the treatment of disease may be wrong, which depends on the physician, considering the body as a mere machine or a laboratory; it goes still further, and tends to sap the foundations of our belief in the doctrines of revealed religion. He who is accustomed to overlook the origin of life and merely to view it as an aggregate of chemical phenomena, finds it not difficult to advance the notion, that life *itself* may be included under the same head, and that the vital principle is only another and more refined form of electricity, and he will not hesitate long before he considers *this* the primal creative force. Though early education may keep him from going to this extreme, yet, his one-sided examination of the phenomena of life, will lead him far in that direction. Hence, arise the daring disciples of Mesmer, and a host of other quasi-investigators, into the mysteries of life, who do not hesitate to materialize thought, and to boast a mastery over the minds of their fellows, by virtue of an electric influence which they *project* from themselves. Hence, also, arise the semi-scientific experiments of Reichenbach on Odyle, and a thousand others much less entitled, on score of mind, to respect than this veteran of science.

All this springs from a blind attachment to the belief, that since chemistry can aid us in the explanation of many actions of the body, therefore we must be indebted to her for a full explanation of life,—it springs from a wrong apprehension of the true relation which chemistry bears to physiology,—a misconception of the true use of the former in explaining the latter.

Chemistry, in its widest range, can only give man a knowledge of the ultimate constituents of matter, the combinations of which they are susceptible, the laws governing such combinations, and the forces thereby developed. But matter presents itself in two forms,—one called unorganized, which is gifted with certain general properties, among which is promi-



nent what has been called *vis inertiae*—a kind of indifference as to what state or condition it may occupy,—the other called organized, which presents a marked contrast to the first, from its being produced in living beings, having its condition under the control of a vital force. The first can be separated into smaller portions,—be removed from its physical connections, while the second being produced in living beings, when separated from them speedily yields to the destructive processes of nature. The first is solely governed by the laws of natural philosophy and chemistry; the second only yields to them as modified by what is called the *vital force*, which force constitutes the mystery of physiology.

The vital force, from the very inception of life—the *punctum alicui* of the organized being—acts in a different manner from any mere mechanical or chemical force, achieves results altogether unattainable by these latter, and is not to be explained by any analogies which may seem to exist between them and it. We can, it is true, reduce the whole mystery of animal life down to that of the existence of a single cell, which shall be absolutely microscopic in its character, and yet we will be foiled if we attempt to explain the production of this starting point of the organism by principles of either mechanics or chemistry. Its very simplicity is still too far above the grasp of mere physical science.

With bodies then made up, so to speak, of an aggregation of such cells, we must find it impossible to explain even this aggregation. Thus we find that there is a something connected with an *organism*, even from its origin, which is far beyond human ken. The very word itself—its derivation primarily from the Greek *εργον*—indicates its application to something which has a work or task assigned it by nature; and we find that an organism differs from a machine in being animated with one life, and requiring all its parts for its own perfection as well as for the conservation of that power in them, which prevents their subjection to the action of decay,—parts removed from the whole become dead, that is they yield to the laws which control inorganic matter; and parts removed from a

machine are not changed at all in their structure nor in their tendency to decay; an organism has the power of repairing the losses of structure, which its own duties necessarily produce, and it only closes its activity when accident may check its operations, or the vital force may have accomplished the mysterious duties for which it was created; the machine gradually wears out, and in its greatest perfection, requires constant repair *ab extra*. There can, necessarily, be no comparison here. Are we more successful in our comparison, if we avail ourselves of all the discoveries of modern chemistry to illustrate the nature of that vital force which builds up and gives character to an organism, and then compare it to chemical action? Are the actions of organs to be explained by the doctrines of chemical affinity, or are the organic constituents governed by any such affinity? Let us examine an example. Among the organic constituents are found two, albumen and fibrine. On examination by the chemist, it is found that they are composed of the same elementary bodies, not widely differing from each other. Both contain carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, phosphorus and sulphur. The chemical difference does not give an insight into the different parts they play in the system. But the former acts as the material, out of which nearly all the tissues are formed, and shows nothing more than an aggregation of granules when examined microscopically. It is converted into fibrine by the vital force, and *then* we find indications of organization. How these are produced, the science of chemistry must ever fail to explain. And if we wish to make them obedient to the laws of chemical affinity, it is necessary first to remove them from the control of the vital force,—we must destroy the life which is in them and then we can subject them to the action of chemical agents. These two compound bodies, along with others, form organs having the same chemical constitution, though with widely different properties. The language of chemistry fails to give expression to the real uses of these two substances, since it is unvarying, while they are constantly changing in their properties.

This is but one instance. Instances might be multiplied to

as many as there are proximate elements in the organism. They would all show as clearly as this one, that the relation chemistry bears to physiology is not that of an interpreter of the causes which originate life and the forces by which the integrity of its processes are carried on, nor of the relation of the structure of parts to the uses for which they are applied. To all, then, we can only assign the explanation that they are caused by the vital force, which is bound in the mystery that attends the origin of all matter,—a mystery not to be fathomed by finite mind.

This vital force pervades the whole range of organic life,—is seen in the monad which passes its brief existence in the sun beam,—in the vegetable, as it develops, from the small seed, bark and wood, trunk and branches, until, as the grand old oak, it extends those branches, covered with myriads of leaves, wide and far, affording protection to man and beast,—in the zoophyte, frail occupant of the seeming transition line from vegetable to animal, with all its animal endowments bound down to a mere vegetating life,—in the beast that with wonderful instinct, seeks out the food necessary for its support, and boldly defends all attacks made against its own life,—and in man, with his far-reaching intellect, enabling him to subdue all the other productions of nature, and convert them into ministers to his wants, comforts and luxuries, whose consummately-formed frame exhibits the perfection of creation, and whose mind and soul mirror forth, dimly though it be, the image of his Creator. In all this range, the vital force manifests its presence,—indescribable in words, but known and felt by us all as a something that supports and preserves the whole from the destruction that is ever awaiting all matter, and from elements warring against it and one another. Like the spirit in Faust, “It moves up and down in the flood of life, in the storm of action it weaves hither and thither. Birth and death—an endless sea—a changing woof—a glowing life,—thus it works at the roaring loom of time and produces the living garments of the Deity.”

Though this vital force gives character to organic matter,

yet physiology has nothing to do with its essential nature or origin. The duties of this science are connected only with its manifestations and the laws regulating them. It can effect nothing, as we have seen, either by abstract chemical disquisitions on the nature of the vital force, nor by endeavors to bring it down to the simplicity of a mere physical agency; and it can also effect nothing by accumulating facts on facts, though they be mountain high, if such accumulation only results in the formation of hypotheses, manufactured from the vague, general resemblances which these facts may bear to each other. Such induction is at best, only calculated to deceive the lover of science in his wanderings through the realm of nature,—just as the *ignis fatuus* leads the benighted traveler over bog and marsh, until he is inextricably involved, while he is laboring under the delusive hope that he is nearing a place of security and protection. Facts have an importance in scientific investigations, but they aid in the establishment of hypotheses only when the means by which they were obtained are of a strictly philosophical character,—that is when they were obtained under the guidance of a sound logic, which does no violence, in the formation of an hypothesis to the materials from which it is formed, and hence produces such hypotheses as are altogether within the bounds of scientific probability.

It is well known that, in that positive form of reasoning—the logical syllogism—though the premises may be in themselves strictly correct—that is, *facts*—yet the conclusion derived from them may be false, on account of there being no proper logical connection between these facts. In like manner will all chemico-physiological conclusions be false, if there is no true logical relation between the facts from which they are deduced.

The aid chemistry brings to physiology consists in *measurably explaining the manifestations of the vital force and its operations in the human system*, not in explaining the nature and origin of this force. This is done by her researches, into the composition and metamorphoses of tissues, into the metamorphoses the ingesta undergo by virtue of certain chemical

actions, into the products of secretion, and into the chemical changes which are brought about in a pathological state of the system. To support this statement, it will be necessary to advert briefly to these points.

The composition of tissues is connected as indissolubly with the functions they are expected to perform as their form. The three, *composition*, *form* and *function*, are so connected, that it is probable, as our knowledge of the human physiology increases, we may be able with any two of these factors to give the third. Form belongs to anatomy, function to physiology, composition to chemistry.

Of the elementary bodies, the sixty-three which have thus far resisted all efforts to be reduced to simpler forms, only eighteen enter into the structure of the human frame. Of these carbon, hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen, with a small amount of sulphur and phosphorus principally make up the structure. So long as the composition of tissues is of the normal chemical character, we have the organs which they form performing their duties in a normal way. Hence the necessity of knowing when this composition is changed, in order to judge of the effects of an abnormal composition, and to ward them off, if possible.

Whenever we recognize an organic constituent through its chemical properties in different parts of the system, whether composing tissues or fluids, we are enabled to reason as to the necessities which require its presence. In all such reasoning, we learn to recognize a positive necessity for the presence or absence of any organic constituent, and as these form the material from which the living body is formed or developed, we can trace the construction of tissues as connected with their uses, and also, to a certain extent, the nature of the metamorphoses they are subject to. The latter is a necessary subject for study, growing out of an attention to the nature of the composition of tissues. These must all, however, be studied, in full view of the fact that organic matter cannot be produced in the laboratory, and that a mysterious vital force accompanies,—guides all these operations. Reasoning, to be correct,

must be chemico-physiological, as well as physiologico-chemical,—must require mere elemental constitution to understand *how* certain effects are produced, and have physiological knowledge of the existence of a vital force to understand *why* such effects occur at all. When “we have examined the origin and decomposition of a substance, we have obtained the firmest base for the explanation of the vital-chemical processes. After having familiarized ourselves with the organic substrata of the animal body, we are still only on the threshold of the study of the composition and functions of the animal juices and tissues.”\* But with a firm basis for the superstructure we propose erecting, it must be seen that the composition of tissues is then readily studied and their functions made intelligible.

As the system is constantly undergoing a waste of its particles, there must, necessarily, be some method of replacing them and of keeping up the integrity of the whole frame. Besides this necessity, there is another,—in the growing state it is absolutely necessary that the particles added shall exceed those removed. This is done by means of the *ingesta*, which are required to undergo certain metamorphoses before they are elaborated into the particular substances required for the nutrition and support of the body. These are of two kinds; one, which is more especially adapted to the construction and maintenance of organs, forming the plasmatic material out of which the tissues are formed, and the other, composed of starch and oleaginous bodies, forming the fatty tissues to be consumed through oxidation in the capillaries for the purpose of keeping up the heat of life. These two kinds of food are of such diverse character, that physiology can trace the effects of a deficiency of either, after she has learned the chemical constitution of the food. From observation alone, independent of chemical analogies, no such results could have been attained.

The first class of food is largely supplied with nitrogen, and as it has been proved that this is indispensable to all organic matter, the conclusion is readily arrived at, that it must be

\* Lehman's Phys. Chem., I. 12.

appropriated to the uses just mentioned, in the body. Upon an examination of this species of food, as compared with the wants of the body, theory suggests that a deterioration of the system would result from a continued use of it alone, and, in practice, the physiologist finds this idea fully substantiated. In the scurvy, for instance, the continued use of salted provisions is found to produce that general depraved condition of the system, which constitutes the disease. There has been too large a supply of animal matter. The administration of fresh vegetable juices restores a balance in the system,—the disease disappears and the system is again restored to health.

Other items of special importance also spring up from a chemical investigation into the nature of the ingesta. Food may be so changed by incipient putridity that a small quantity shall revolutionize the whole system. Formerly this was perfectly unexplainable. Now, although the cause may be bound up in mystery, yet the effect has been traced to its cause, and organic chemistry has shown that by the introduction of a small quantity of contagious matter into the blood, it there acts as a species of ferment and corrupts the whole. From this result, attention has been paid to the subject of the depravation of the blood, and many results have been obtained, which have been made of great service in the hands of physiology.

The second class of food is non-nitrogenized and adapted to the maintenance of animal temperature. This explains the enormous quantities of fat consumed by the inhabitants of northern climes, with whom even train oil is a delicacy. The intense cold, to which they are exposed, requires a large amount of internal heat to make up for that which escapes by radiation from the surface,—hence, large quantities of fuel, that is fatty substances, must be supplied to support the necessary combustion. The same thing is seen in inhabitants of a temperate clime. During an inclement winter they eat with relish fat meats which their palates utterly eschew when the almost vertical rays of the sun, in midsummer, fall upon them.

Having thus apprehended the exact uses of this kind of food,



and the nature of the changes it is made to undergo in the system, physiology then proceeds to generalize upon it and finds the application, by way of explaining the reason, that some animals are carnivorous and others graminivorous.\* The former, being active in their habits, have heat generated in this way, and require food similar in composition to their own flesh, merely to repair the waste of material which their constant activity produces; while the latter, on account of the freedom with which they perspire—that is throw heat off from the surface—require material which shall generate heat to make up this deficiency, and this material is found in the non-nitrogenized substances which make up their food. From these facts, reverting to man, we are ready to explain how an omnivorous animal changes his food in obedience to the requirements of labor or the nature of the seasons,—selecting as the constant accompaniment of all his meals, when in a civilized condition, exactly such articles as combine the two kinds of food.

By means of *secretion*, certain substances are removed from the system, and others are elaborated for additional service. Here chemistry has shown the results of secretion and aided physiology in determining what may constitute the normal or healthy condition of the secreting organs, by showing her what are the products in a normal condition, and enabling her indirectly to apply proper therapeutic means when these are abnormal. Thus in pathology, which is but the physiology of disease, the relation of chemistry is that of an auxiliary, most reliable and indispensable. For though all the chemical actions, already adverted to, are under the guidance of the vital force, and hence by no means identical with operations in the laboratory, yet we can judge of the nature of their derangement by the changes which it produces in these actions. Deranged secretion itself is shown, in a majority of cases, to proceed, not from a local derangement of the secretory organs, but from a pathological condition of the blood, which provokes precisely the character of secretions, manifest on examination, being the effects of disease and not the cause. The treatment

---

\* Carpenter's Human Physiology.

in all such cases, of course, requires attention to the prime cause of the disease.

The whole range of physiology is thus illumined by the torch, which chemistry holds up for its study. Without this light, the investigator of nature but follows blindly the sound of hollow theories, alike indicative of want of mental courage to grapple with the difficulties of his position, and of positive enfeeblement in the chains of ignorance or superstition. This blind adherence to notions, which have the *authority* of the past, since that past had not the means of investigating a subject as fully as the present, is to be deprecated in matters of science. Our acquaintance with science itself is but as of yesterday; therefore the conclusions men have arrived at, before it was known at all, are of no avail, unless they shall be found true and reliable, when examined by the light of the present. Reverence for the past is indispensable in the study of theology or history, when the past constitutes a necessary link in the whole chain, or rather when it acts as the trunk from which have been developed the sturdy limbs of the present. For the past of science this reverence cannot obtain to such an extent; there is a standard of truth, becoming more and more clear and reliable every day, by which all conclusions must be tried and must stand or fall by its decisions. Indeed, to a certain extent, our reliance on this standard, shows a high regard for the past, since, *it* is not the creation of a day, but the result of truths which have been deduced from the knowledge of all time.

The very advances made by physiology, through the aid of chemistry, have, however, made its students neglect too much the mystery of that life which pervades and gives its peculiar character to organized matter. They have become impatient of having any mystery connected with the actions of the body. Hence sentiments, like the following, occur far too often in treatises of the higher order, on the subject of physiological chemistry: "We cannot rest satisfied with the mysterious obscurity in which they (*viz*: vital phenomena and vital forces) have been artificially enveloped. We believe, with the diffi-

dence beseeching a genuine student of nature, that it would be wiser and more conducive to the spread of true knowledge, to adhere, in the study of vital processes, to matter, and to the laws by which it is determined, than following the fictitious abstractions of dynamical processes, to assume that there exists in life a higher power of the spiritual force pervading matter."\* Nor does the averment which follows—that "our most exalted conception of nature and the sublimest natural philosophy emanate from the very simplicity of physical laws and the unlimited variety of phenomena to which they give rise," relieve such views from their positive tendency to materialism.

It is becoming then, in the man of science, not to be so blinded by the light she is shedding in his chamber, or over his researches in the laboratory, that he shall forget that far more brilliant light which streams with such resplendent rays that his mortal eyes are unable to receive their full splendor, and can only recognize their presence as reflected in the works of nature.

As to the practical utility of a proper understanding of the true relation which exists between chemistry and physiology, it might be sufficient to say that truth requires not to be sustained by arguments based on utility, but demands to be upheld and understood on account of its own merits. Here, however, utility manifests itself so plainly, that, independent of the truth involved in this question, the medical man must see, he can practice his profession more intelligently, when he comprehends the true nature of the aids science brings to the study of man, than when by a blind adherence to science alone, he merely looks at man as a grand illustration of its principles. In practice he will find that chemical laws are subject, in the human body, to the controlling power of something, which at times holds in check, and again hastens the play of chemical affinities,—that organized matter, so long as it remains under the dominion of this something, is not subject to chemical laws,

\* Lehman's Phys. Chem., I. 22.

but rather sets at defiance these laws and only bows down to them when it loses its connection with the living body.

Organic chemistry needs no fanatical support to present its discoveries in a proper point of view. Such support is always injurious. It attracts *some* friends, who may be enthusiastic, but also raises up many enemies. The good, therefore, derived from fanatical support, is more than overbalanced by the evil which necessarily accompanies it.

A wide field is open for study in organic chemistry,—a field as yet comparatively untilled, bearing near the surface the richest ore in return for the labor which shall be expended in its cultivation. To follow the course of inorganic matter, first into the vegetable kingdom, where it is elaborated and prepared for the wants of the animal, then its metamorphosis into organized tissue, the functions it is capable of under this form, and finally its form and constitution when it is rejected from the organism;—to see that the highest efforts of chemistry have only succeeded in forming the *products* of organized matter, but have never approximated to the synthesis of a particle of this matter;—to see how affinity is held at bay by the force of vitality in the organs, and how coincidently with the departure of the latter it asserts its supremacy;—to examine with a careful eye to their utility the unvarying composition of the tissues in a state of health, and to mark how a change here indicates a morbid condition of the system;—to watch the progress of the life giving blood, bearing its rich stream of nutriment to all portions of the body, and with its return current carrying off, to various points for their discharge, such particles as may be no longer needed to keep up its integrity,—these are subjects worthy of man's daily and nightly study,—the highest character of mind—the most extensive range of thought. They show that man is both "fearfully and wonderfully made." In such studies, we find that no act of life is performed without an accompanying destruction of some particles of matter belonging to the organs by which the act is performed,—that thus death is a constant attendant on life, and though an entire absence of action in the body implies its

death, yet its life cannot be maintained without the death of some of its particles. Notwithstanding this continued wasting away of the organism, under favoring circumstances, neither its form nor faculties are injured, but the same power which dissevers effete particles, appropriates new material, so that the symmetry of the whole shall be kept up. This power is not found in inorganic matter. It is true, that when the latter is called upon to execute force, its particles have to change their relation to each other, but it has no inherent power to call in other particles of matter to replace those lost. This inherent power, self-constructive, self-preservative, and self-reproducing—peculiar to the organic kingdom—to that part of creation possessing life—is styled vital power, or vital force. It is a mystery bound up with the mystery of life itself.

Our subject has been chosen since it seemed to deserve careful attention at the present time. The tendency of mankind is bearing it on towards the adoption of chemical explanations of all vital phenomena. We object to this, because some phenomena can only be examined so far as the laws which govern their appearance, the nature of the cause which produces them being beyond the range of human knowledge, and because such a tendency will deprive us of our belief in anything higher than matter and reduce all our thinking to mere materialism; and in addition to these objections, there is another, the natural consequence of a tendency to this extreme may produce from reaction, one in a very opposite direction, resulting in an entire opposition to all chemical study.

The domain of chemistry is wide enough for exploration without adding to it subjects which do not belong to its proper bounds. No science so richly deserves the commendation which Davy gave chemistry—"Its beginning is pleasure; its progress knowledge; its objects, truth and utility."

Baltimore, Md.

L. H. S.

## ART. V — THE LAND OF BLESSEDNESS.\*

## FIRST ARTICLE.

IN what relation does the Christian dogmatic of the present time stand to the scientific survey of the universe, which we are enabled to make by the aid of late astronomical discoveries? The question is important; for it is necessary that there should be a harmony here, so that the Christian faith, on the one hand, and true astronomical science, on the other, should suffer no disparagement. True, it might be objected that Christian faith and astronomy have nothing to do with each other, and even that Christian faith, in its scientific conception, as dogmatic knowledge, could ignore at once all astronomical revelations, which seem to come in its way; but this view is not reasonable. The results of astronomical researches have already become popular, and have mingled themselves with the thoughts of the learned when they take a survey of the world, hence they meet with the doctrines of faith in the minds of the people. How can these two systems meet and live together in the spirits of men without disturbing each other, or struggling to harmonize themselves by a true reconciliation? This would be contrary to the nature of things. Faith longs to harmonize everything with itself, and to pervade it with its spirit; it desires to make everything religiously transparent and holy, and to change all knowledge into theology. On the other hand, it lies in the nature of firm scientific conviction that it cannot tolerate a religious connection if the mind is not consciously assured of an inward harmony between the two. As long as the spiritualistic tendency in theology predominates, according to which, for instance, men will know only an *inward*

\* Translated from the German of Dr. J. P. Lange.

heaven and an *inward* hell, without considering that the inward must ever have an outward too—so long will the above mentioned necessity of a complete harmony between Christian faith and astronomical science, not come to a full accomplishment. This tendency, however, will be annulled by the power of a great and prevailing axiom. There is nothing hid that shall not be revealed ; so says this axiom. Or in other words: The Word became flesh. Even the human spirit is manifested through a bodily form ; the promises of the Gospel realize themselves in the holy sacraments ; the immortality of the soul has its completion in the resurrection of the body ; and so too the inward heaven of the blest, and the inward hell of the lost, must complete themselves by becoming manifest in an outward heaven and an outward hell. Thus we see in this world a thievish nature manifests itself in the robber, the robber comes to a complete manifestation in the robber's den, and in the band to which he belongs. We have, however, only considered the half of this axiom ; the other half implies, that in, under, and with that which is manifest, the spiritual is always and everywhere to be sought. Thus the earth itself will be seen not to lie outside of spiritual operations, of divine presence and of heavenly space,\* and that heaven, as our Father's house in the heavens, does not only begin beyond the region of the stars, even if it does extend far beyond the farthest star that the telescope can discover. In the presence and power of this twin axiom, materialism, on the one hand, and false spiritualism on the other, must pass away.

There must, therefore, a harmony be found between the Christian and astronomical modes of surveying the heavens. This harmony Dr. Bretschneider has attempted to effect in the sense of the vulgar rationalism. He contended that natural

---

\*We have no objection to the assertion that earth is included in the heavenly space, if it is only considered so in the way of a preparatory platform in due time to be removed ; but could not agree to it, if it is intended to teach that it shall always exist as part of heaven proper. This we conceive to be an anti-scriptural idea. We would, therefore, only endorse this sentiment of the author so far as it means to represent this world as a pre-stage, or typical shadow, which is to find its true substance and completion hereafter in the higher manifestations of the heavenly world.—[THE TRANSLATOR.]



science had come to stand in opposition to Christian faith, and that now all that stood opposed to the result of modern researches must be dropped from our faith as the fancies of the world's ignorant ages. Heaven and hell—so exclaimed the good Doctor—heaven and hell have vanished in the light of modern discoveries. Under the earth where hell was supposed to lie, there live our beloved antipodes, the Americans; thus we must seek for the under-world of the damned where the New World smiles in the light of its own joy and prosperity; unless indeed we should be content to find, in the deep caves of the earth, the prisons of lost spirits, which as the laboratories of nature, are ill suited to such a purpose. And where heaven was supposed to lie, above the blue canopy, we see the infinity of worlds stretch themselves out over the blue sea of ether, an infinity of which we can form no adequate conception. This was about the substance and sense of Bretschneider's argument, which we cannot give in his own words. According to his conceptions, the deep and sacred contents of the Holy Scripture, as they are embalmed, preserved and presented in a religious survey of the universe, were identical with the crass, and common representations, which the Christian mind had conceived, in this respect, in earlier ages. When Christ speaks of the flames of hell, and of the pains which the rich man suffered in it, it is known that we have higher, more ideal and sensible conceptions than when a collier of Saxony, in these orthodox days, speaks of hell fire. Even if now we do not, according to the popular fancies, seek hell in smoking caves, or in deep chasms of the earth, but in dungeons in the storm-swept solitudes and outer darkness of creation, we may find such dungeons in the craters of the moon, such solitudes in Jupiter, and such outer darkness in Uranus. We would be very reluctant to contend that hell is to be found in the depth of our planet-system from the sun away, in the distant stormy and dark regions of those planets which revolve farthest from the sun. We do not, however, go beyond the sphere of scientific knowledge when we point to such dark and mysterious realms, and say, Behold in our Father's house are

many mansions, and among them are also abodes of gloomy and horrible appearance, and it betrays, to say the least, great ignorance, to doubt, when we see such an abundance of dark planets and comets sweeping through the gloomy outskirts of space, that *it is possible for an outward hell to exist*. The same is true of the reality of an outward heaven. It is known that the white glistening peaks of the mountains are no olympic habitation of the gods, as the heathen dreamed, but this does not trouble us. It is known that heaven is not a single, near us, and extensive hall, resting upon the canopy above which covers us, as simple people and children have supposed; but yet it would be worse than senseless, if we should, on this account, doubt the existence of an *external* heaven, when we see the light of many calm and high habitations in our Father's house. Hence, the Christian faith need sacrifice none of its biblical purity, or of its dogmatic treasures, in order to effect a harmony with a scientific survey of the universe. On the other hand, scientific astronomy must not be made to sacrifice any of its truths in seeking after this harmony. That the Roman Church for some time considered it necessary to combat the Copernican system and oppose it even to the persecution of Galileo, to subserve the interests of religion, need only be mentioned here. More remarkable is the fact that this opposition to the doctrine of Copernicus, and a holding fast to the old geocentric system has been continued in some branches of the Protestant Church. These ideas exist because those who hold them honor, in a cabalistic manner, the letter of certain passages of Scripture and hang in slavish adherence to old theosophical systems that evidently rest on the ptolemaic astronomy. The same is true with regard to those systems, according to which, for instance, much account is made of the seven planets then only known; for since more have been discovered these calculations no more harmonize, and all falls to ruins, like an old weather-beaten skeleton, when it is attempted to remove it from its place. Christianity itself is free from this false positiveness which constructs systems only to crumble to ruins under the living force of scientific progress. Its

dogmas are taken out of the fountains of truth and life; hence it reigns over all scientific advancement, like a finished word which the reader has in his mouth over the word in formation, which he who spells slowly is constructing out of letters: and it is its mission to give a religious direction to all investigations, and to the progress of science in all its stages. Those systems, therefore, which harden themselves against well established deductions of scientific astronomy, have no promise for the future, and Christian doctrine will give them no thanks for their well-meant opposition to the discoveries of science.

The Hegelian system, too, seems to have some interest in contracting the new astronomy, at least in its nearest and most direct consequences; or at least to rob it of its Christian and religious animation. Inasmuch as the system attempts to elevate the human spirit to be throne prince of the universe, we can easily see why it should have an interest in giving this turn to astronomical science. Just as we see at the funeral processions of great ones, that a number of empty carriages follow along behind the hearse;—so here, the stars of heaven are made a retinue to parade round the earth while it bears away the great human spirit to the place of skulls, where it is buried in the old generations to rise again in the new, and celebrates, in this process, its own apotheosis or deification. The universe dare not be supposed to be inhabited, or too dangerous concurrences would be experienced in the attempt to ascribe the excellence of spiritual consciousness, or of divine self-consciousness separate and alone to the human spirit. The spiritual hosts of heaven, the angels of the Lord, the strong princes of the upper world are also, accordingly, in this system, vast figures which it seeks to set aside as personifications of the figurative style of Scripture. It is almost simple to think that attempts are made to sacrifice biblical Christianity to the interests of philosophy, when we consider that its object is to depopulate the world of its spirits and its angels, thereby to save the interests of human excellence. We must, however, earnestly protest against making the Bible speak such a language. It is not at all surprising that Richter, going out from

Hegelian premises, attempted to confirm the fanatical denial of the doctrine of immortality even by declarations of the New Testament; but it is not only a matter of astonishment, but of pity, when, besides this, believing and excellent men, as friends of the Hegelian philosophy, seek to maintain the above standpoint, in reference to the view of the world and the old doctrine of angels. In support of what has now been said, we present a passage found in Tholuck's *Literarischer Anzeiger*, (Nr. 66 Jahrg. 1836) which has evidently been written in the spirit of the Hegelian philosophy. The author there is reviewing the writings of WOLFGANG MENGEL, "*Geist der Geschichte.*" The considerations with which he exposes this author, in reference to other matters, are excellent, written with clearness and judgment, and in consistency with divine truth. What is written, however, under the title, "*Astronomical Problems,*" must more necessarily be opposed from Scripture ground, because the Bible itself is here made to speak falsely. The passage holds this language: "In this section the respected author treats of the connection of the earth with the sun, with the other planets, and with the whole starry world, although he himself, in his introduction, has called this connection an unsolved and unsolvable riddle. Why did he not remember that the reason of this may be, that no human want requires that this connection should be understood in the way in which he seeks to understand it. The Holy Scriptures, which satisfy the highest wants of men of this kind, give no clue to this and the reason certainly is because they presuppose the direct opposite of what the author conjectures. To the author that conception seems necessary, because he supposes that the rest of the planets are inhabited by human beings; the Holy Scriptures pass over this question entirely, because they go on the presupposition that the earth is the only orb inhabited by rational beings; for of the angels no one will contend that they are considered inhabitants of any particular planet. (Compare Schliermacher I§. 51 I. I A.) True, it is at present critical for a person to express himself on this point against the almost general opinion, and in accordance with the Holy Scrip-

tures, but when it is remembered that the whole economy of salvation is built upon this presupposition, it will not be expected that we should suffer ourselves to be bribed or disheartened by the reasonings of our present philosophy, however pompous be its pretensions. (Com. e. g. Schliermacher, a. a. o.) According to the Old Testament, God created the sun, moon, and stars, *that they should shine down upon the earth, and divide the time.* It does not speak of any other use to which they were appointed. Why do not men, in this respect, admire the (in other respects so deep) history of creation? Man he makes in his image; not a word is said of other beings *in his image.* There can be only *one* image of the archetype, for a second would be either, so to speak, a tautological repetition, or an imperfect and untrue image. Hence also God, in the rest of the Old Testament, sustains a relation only to man, and is represented as directing all his activities upon the human race. In the New Testament men are redeemed out of their alienation from God, by God becoming man, and here it is laid down as a truth that man can become one with God without surrendering his human being; for the unity of God and man in Christ Jesus is, viewed from the human side, an exaltation of man in God. (Com. Schliermacher I§. 20. I.) The union disturbed by sin was restored again in Christ, and thus the faded consciousness of it renewed for the rest of men, who through faith in Christ and the redemption of his spirit, were made capable in the same manner to become one with God; for in union with Christ they have union with God. Hence God finds himself again in the human spirit, which has broken through this separation, or disunion; in no other way can we represent to ourselves the relation of spirits, different from God, to God, than under the idea of fall and redemption; and in the fellowship of the redeemed, which constitutes the Christian Church, we necessarily conceive to ourselves that we find a perfect transcript of the Divine Spirit, since Christ lives in her, who was "the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person," (Heb. 1: 3.) We have, accordingly, no conception of finite spirits, spirits not redeemed by Christ,

and not belonging to the Christian Church as the true transcript of the Divine Spirit, which warrants us entirely to deny their existence, or to set them aside as not concerning our relation to God. A farther array of argument is not needed here. What has been said is only intended to show how little the author had a right to build his theory on a supposition which stands in opposition to the dogma of the incarnation of Christ."

In the first place, the author, in this passage, makes the Scripture "*presuppose* that the earth is the only planet inhabited by rational beings." The proof he borrows from Schliermacher's dogmatic; it is said, namely, that of the angels it cannot be affirmed that they are considered as inhabitants of any given planet. We do not see how Schliermacher can be warranted on this account, to represent the angels as intermediate beings between these worlds.

Had not Schliermacher, according to a well known exegesis, evaporated in a spiritualistic way the passage in Eph. 1: 20, 21, or Col. 1: 16, he would have been forced to admit the existence of principalities, powers, mights, and dominions, as inhabitants of the future and higher world. The conception of intermediate beings, floating in pure ether, without being at home in some department of corporeal existence, is rather a modern Jean Paulish dream, than a representation of Holy Writ. How can the healthy and holy sense of Scripture, as to the principle of order and form in which it reveals the whole spirit-world, in which e. g. it speaks of the third heaven, of the many mansions in the Father's house, of the heavens, and on the other hand, of the abodes of the dark spirits,—how can this grand view into the creation have any sympathy with this empty and hollow idea of intermediate ethereal habitations. In the book of Job already, God appears to set the angels in a significant connection with the stars, when he says: "The morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy." And where does the Bible place the blessed who have left the world? In the intermediate ether? Of this it knows nothing; but it does know of a heaven, from

which Moses and Elias descended, and to which the Saviour went in his ascension. Hence, we see that the Scriptures presuppose something quite different from the idea that the earth is the only inhabited world. In nothing has the Bible spoken mistakingly, so that the new astronomy can call to her, *si tacuisses, et cet.!* Its intimations are adequate to the richest and deepest longings that will be found in either present or future science, in reference to the infinite population of the "many mansions" in our Father's house. A transient philosophy may have some interest at stake which will induce it to deny the existence of a flourishing population inhabiting the upper regions, but the Bible has none. The glory of the human spirit which comes thus to an apprehension of itself, and through this to its own deification, may have a shadow cast over its own pride at the thought of armies of spirits dwelling in all the starry spheres, choiring in those holy halls in the city of God above; but in this way the glory of Christ, as the first born among many creatures, who has raised a lost world out of an abyss of ruin through infinite humiliation and faithfulness in suffering, is not advanced; neither does it exalt in our minds the prerogatives of those who are come up through great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. We freely concede that the Holy Scriptures do not point out the heavenly habitations of which they speak as being stars or orbs in an astronomical sense or conception. If they did this, they would have transcended the bounds of the religious development of the truth. According to their representations, however, of the multiplicity of angelic natures, and their description of the order of the heavens, according to which, there is a first, second and third heaven, we are allowed to make deductions which lead us to the belief that many worlds compose the heavenly regions. When we see that in the Revelations of John, the Church is spoken of as a woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars, we may consider it doubtful whether such a bright part of the universe would be spoken of as a part of this exalted woman's



costume, without intending that the passage should contain some mysterious dogmatical meaning.

If, then, we must refuse to accept the dubious praise bestowed upon the Bible by the assertion that it presupposes the earth to be the only inhabited planet, we must reject with still firmer decision the following idea that the whole system of salvation is built upon this presupposition. The system of salvation is built neither on geological nor on astronomical views of any kind, and least of all, upon such *contracted* and *suspicious* presuppositions. It may be that the modern Pagoda, in which the human spirit, as the only and highest world-spirit, is glorified, can find room enough upon the small plain of earth; but the Church needs, for her development, a wider and freer range of space, and another and a firmer basis than is afforded by such mystical presuppositions. The system of salvation, then, as regards its *foundation*, has nothing to do with different astronomical views of the universe; but as to its *development* it needs a considerable platform—a heaven for the angels, a higher heaven for the Lord himself, a Hades for the unredeemed spirits, and a deeper hell for the devils and the damned. If even in the history of the creation, as recorded in the Old Testament, nothing is said of a farther object in the creation of the sun and moon, than to shine on the earth and divide the season, it is not in this denied in the least that they may have a farther design, as the author seems also disposed to allow. For he says farther: "Man, God made in his own image; nothing is said of other beings having been made in the image of God. There can be only one image of the archetype, for a second would be, so to speak, a tautological repetition, or an imperfect or untrue image. Hence, also, in the rest of the Old Testament, God stands related to man alone, and is represented as directing all His activities towards the human race." The same mode of reasoning which the author employs against the plurality of spiritual beings, we could employ against the plurality of human beings. If man exists from his origin as an image of God, why, we may ask, do we see the tautological repetition of this image in countless

generations and individuals? Does the author tell us: They are only single features of the same image which comes only to exist in full completion in the whole of humanity? Then we answer farther: That this extension of the image of God in the essence of free spirits is already so infinite, that it may still extend through the measureless creation without danger of tautology on the one hand, or of imperfection on the other. But how can it be predicated of God, who calls himself Lord of SABAOTH, that in the Old Testament he sustains a relation to man alone? Are not angels continually spoken of in the Old Testament? The angels are messengers sent from God; thus He, at least, sustains this relation to them that he sends them. We will not waste time in unfolding the rich fulness of the doctrine concerning angels, or to prove that the Bible does not speak of personifications merely, but that it speaks in the plainest manner of the angels of the Lord who excel in strength, of the shining spirits which dwell in heaven and stand before God—this is abundantly known to every unprejudiced person.

Hence, we may well ask with surprise: Why do men seek to enforce upon the Bible an alliance by which it is compelled flatly to contradict itself? The author finally says, in granting the utmost: "Thus God finds himself again in the human spirit, which has surmounted this separation; and in no other way can we represent to ourselves the relations of spirits, differing from God, to God, than by the representation of fall and redemption." So, certainly, the Bible has nowhere spoken; nowhere has it said: God finds himself again in the human spirit, having surmounted the separation. Injustice is done to the Bible when a peculiar philosophy is ascribed to it as the medium through which it views things. The God of the Hindoo Veda may perhaps lose and find himself again; but the God of the Bible, as the true Shepherd, finds again the lost sheep, or, as the faithful Father, permits himself to be found of the lost and erring child. Thus there appears, in the Bible, neither firstly the fall, nor secondly the redemption, of beings differing from God, as a necessity. For the angels of heaven are beings differing from God, and yet they are not fallen; the angels of darkness are represented as fallen, and yet nothing

is made known in regard to their salvation. And it is certain of believers alone, that they were first lost by the fall, and were afterwards brought back again to God by means of redemption. Here then we have opportunity of selecting at pleasure spirits of every class and kind: unfallen spirits that remained pure; fallen spirits redeemed again; and fallen spirits not redeemed. The system of the author, however, can only refer and apply to the second kind of spirits; and it is, therefore, quite too contracted to become the organ of the rich and broad contents of Scripture. Does it fail to reach the length and breadth of Scriptural teachings in this respect, it fails equally in comprehending its depths and heights. This it is easy to show; for there is no depth there, if we consider the horrible fall of man as a fatal necessity in his history; and there is no height, if the free act of divine grace in his salvation is also reduced to a plain necessity, which is at once understood of itself. But what follows from these last mentioned observations, is this: Either the whole universe, including all its stars, must be a desolate and empty waste, at least not inhabited by spirits, (and in this direction this conclusion leans) or on all stars old Adam, with his sorrows, must dwell, on all stars the cross must stand, and Christ must travel his suffering way for the salvation of the spirit-hosts. Thus then, according to this system, if we would not admit the frightful hypothesis of an empty universe, the human race must lose the sad precedence, which is to be to them, through God's mercy, the occasion of a peculiar exaltation and glorification over the unfallen spirits.

We have briefly alluded to these controverted views, as views belonging to the Hegelian system. It is, however, proper to remark, that this system, in different organs, has also different phases, growing out of each other, and sometimes contradicting each other, so that at the same time both Christian and anti-christian tendencies appear in the school of Hegel. Already on this account we do not wish, in a sweeping way, to charge the whole school with holding the above views; and also because we cannot, as yet, see through the system as a

whole, standing before us, as it does, in a state of dark evolution. It cannot be concealed, that this philosophy has enriched itself with the great results of philosophical inquiry, which have already been reached in reference to the human spirit; and that it is, nevertheless, original; that it has done much in the way of mediation between the Christian idea and the intellectual apprehension of it, and that it has not yet completed all its useful and suggestive evolutions. But it is also not to be concealed, that a bold denial of personal immortality, a degrading of the Holy Scriptures to a mine of religious myths, and the consequent denial of the historical Christ himself, stand also in intimate sympathy with the ground principles and premises of this philosophy. Thus it appears to us, it might be compared, in its dark origin, to that mysterious womb, from which at the same time was born the beloved Jacob and the hated Esau; which last sells his birth-right for a mess of pottage, and thus throws himself into the arms of materialism. The above mentioned author certainly belongs, upon the whole, to the better and more Christian tendency of this philosophy, and hence it is so much the more to be lamented that in such an essential point he should have been ensnared by such contradictory views. This certainly cannot be explained except upon the ground that *a current leading in that direction runs through the whole system.* In the mind of the honored Gœschel, however, this current takes a modified, ennobling, and purer course. In his work "*HEGEL AND HIS TIMES*," we find on the 27th page, the following, which is said by him to the praise of the Hegelian system: "Yes, it appears at times as if we were to be translated back into the dark, when the Copernican system was condemned; for we discover that the sun is still subordinated to the earth, that the sun is only an elementary quality, only an abstract moment of the individual earth, and that the earth is the true concrete, on the contrary, that the sun is only the abstract centre. Here, it is true, the empirical correctness of the heliocentric phenomena is not denied, but the higher truth of the geocentric appearance is maintained, and the language which to this day is geocentric, is adjudged to

have, not only a relative, but an absolute correctness. Externally viewed, this heaven-storming opposition to astronomy seems not only absurd, but also unpoetical ; for the sun, which quickens, enraptures, and enlivens all being, is only employed as a servile instrument of the planets, the centre being assigned to it only for conscience' sake, and in this way the most common teleological view is kept in honor. On the other hand, we must also censure the poetical cheat of egotism ; for behold ! we see bowing before the earth, as in Joseph's dream, sun, moon and stars. Besides, this much is clear, that also in the Holy Scriptures, the earth is the central point, upon which God himself appears and becomes man in the fulness of time, from before whom sun, moon, and stars recede. Luke 23 : 45. Acts 2 : 20. Josh. 10 : 12, 13. Gen. 1 : 15-17. In the Calendar the earth is represented as a globe with a cross."

We agree most heartily with the honored author, as to the perfect agreement of Biblical and Christian with astronomical views, according to what is known in astronomy ; but from this it does not yet follow, that the astronomer must give the same preponderance to the earth from his stand-point, as the Christian must from his. We will freely permit the earth to retain the honor of that one peculiarity which it enjoys among all the planets, as the theatre of God's glorious revelations in his grace, through the incarnation of his Son. And inasmuch as the mystery of that great salvation, which the faithful have seen and received, is designated as that into which angels desire to look, the earth, as associated with this mystery of salvation, may well be pointed out as a festive BETHLEHEM, before which sun, moon, and stars may rightly bow. We must, however, not forget that the same God, which appears on earth, has his throne in the heavens ; and that the same earth, which has been so highly blessed through the dispensation of salvation, is nevertheless, on the other hand, according to her old constitution, the home of sin and mortality—even a dark NAZARETH, over which the rich and royal heaven is extended, with all its homes of light, and the regions of blessedness. The heavens are God's throne, the earth is his footstool. The will

of God is to be done here on earth as it is done in heaven, through the gift of the Father who is in the heavens. Christ has ascended into heaven; there he will receive his own into everlasting mansions; there is the free, the heavenly Jerusalem—and the earth must first be glorified through a fiery metamorphosis before the heavenly city will descend upon her plains. True, we may be asked: What has heaven to do with sun, moon, and stars? We answer: The inward is not without the outward; hence the homes of the blest who shine as the sun, must be illumined habitations—bright and radiant worlds on high. The reverse is also true, that the outward is not without the inward; for this reason we cannot possibly conceive of the starry worlds as profane wastes, forsaken of spirits, and lying outside of heaven. Only then should we err by too much positiveness, if we should say, yonder sun, or that particular star of the first, second, or third magnitude, and so on, these are the homes of our sainted friends. We may locate the city of God where the divine glory unfolds itself in the most refined and radiant spirits, where Christ reigns with his saints blest in the vision of God, as high as we will above the visible stars, and above the reach of the largest telescopes, yet must we ever conceive of the way to it, as a way through the visible world of stars, a way through the heavens (through the regions inhabited by spirits;) and we cannot represent that highest point to which our faith ascends, either as an entirely *inner* heaven, nor yet as a place of detention in dark and formless ether. It is not the body, but the spirit, which is the essential of man; not those orbs or worlds are the essentials, but God's indwelling spirit in these worlds; but just as the spirit of man comes to a blooming manifestation in his body, so also heaven, in the upper worlds; yes, even in its first degrees here on earth already is heaven manifested, since the earth itself consecrated in Christ to God, is itself changed again into the heavenly essence.

We turn, finally, to the original fountain of the views which we have just been calling to account. Hegel, in his *Encyclopedia*, third edition, §. 270, says: "In regard to those bodies,

in which the idea of gravity realizes itself freely, they have their force of determination, to accomplish the destiny involved in their particular natures. *One is therefore the general centre of all abstract relations to itself.* The planetary orbs, as the direct or immediate *concrete*, are in their existence the most perfect. We are accustomed to consider the sun the most excellent, inasmuch as the understanding prefers the abstract to the concrete, *as also even the fixed stars are regarded with more consideration than the bodies of the solar system.*" Although these declarations contain no satisfactory explanation, they nevertheless express a decided tendency: First, to exalt the bodies of the solar system over the fixed stars; second, to set the planets of our solar system over the sun; and thirdly, in this system to consider one as the general centre. Thus then the earth is the culminating point in the universe. And on the earth is the hearth-home around which culminates the so-called philosophy of that spirit which has come to a conscious apprehension of itself. And without doubt the notion of the infinite littleness of the earth, as represented by Hegel is only secondary—a consequence of the primary notion concerning the infinite greatness of the human spirit. ESCHENMAYER, too, in his work entitled: "The religious Philosophy of Hegel compared with the Christian Principle," has charged this system with taking this view of the enormous littleness of the universe. He says §. 32, "Hegel confines his God chiefly to this small speck of earth. In nature, life, history and individual self-consciousness here, it is that God is expected to come to a full revelation of himself. For Hegel there exists no higher beings, no higher nature, no higher life, no higher scheme of creation, but what is produced and perfected out of this poor race of earth. He who in regard to God and the universe, confines his thoughts to the earth and the race which inhabits it, resembles the mole, which considers the ridge which he himself has cast up as the whole world. Such a philosophy belongs to the Platonic cave, in which the formula of reason, like the stalactites, construct a world of their own of figures, which he who is confined in it at first takes as his world, till he



looks out at the cave's narrow mouth, and thus sets himself right in reference to the vast extent of the heavens above him. Who can believe, that this small fragment of human history is to be taken as the measure of God's universal scheme, which comprehends all the stars in the universe—that the physical and organic evolutions of earth are to be taken as the archetype of all the vast world of spheres—that, in general, the individual self-consciousness of man is to be taken as the mirror of God. This is the pride of philosophy, which deifies its own conceptions, and with the drop of a bucket would measure the ocean." With propriety and force, it appears to us, does Eschenmayer exhibit the unreconciled contradiction between the theses of the above-named philosophy and the clear known results of the latest science of the earth and the heavens, in condemnation of this philosophy.\* Yes, the stars of heaven, under the influence of this system, are all threatened with a transformation into monsters. And how will it defend itself, when it has arrayed against it all the Scriptural hosts and rolling orbs of heaven which glorify God, and above which even He is exalted and praised as the LORD OF SABAOOTH. How will it stand against these bright and blazing arguments of day and night, which prove the littleness of earth and the greatness of the heavens, and which induce us so easily, so naturally, and so necessarily to infer the existence of manifold orders of heavenly spirits over and above the human race! Are even the above-mentioned conceptions defended by strong and good men, yet, in the long run, they will not be able to accomplish anything in opposition to the heavenly armies; they will drop their colors when the Great and Little Bear, the Lion and all the threatening powers of the starry world are marshalled out against them. We confess that the system, in its dialectics, may be called strong; it arises like a true Achilles; but the astronomical conceptions which it publishes as its

---

\* When therefore Strauss holds up to view the philosophy of Eschenmayer as somnambulist, it may be remarked in reference to it, that it is nevertheless not *monomaniac* through the magnetic influence of one moon, but rather has become *clear-sighted* through the united influence of the bright universal which it contemplates.

own, this is its weakness, this is the heel of Achilles. Hence it will not in the least astonish us, if sooner or later, the blazing Dragon—the Northern Serpent of the heavens, shall dart forth like lightning to wound the heel of this Achilles with a deadly bite; or if the Archer of the firmament shall let fly his golden arrow, and triumphantly prostrate this heroic enemy. The proud giant form will fall and sink, but the immortal part of it will be saved. We may, then, from the same work, from which the most of the Hegelian quotations are made—Goethe's *Faustus*—select its epitaph, and, with the alteration of but one word, say:

To give the human spirit honor rare,  
This Titan-system blows sun, moon,  
And stars, like vapors into empty air.

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

#### ART. VI. SHORT NOTICES.

ESSAYS ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS. *By his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman.* In three volumes. London: Dolman. Baltimore: Murphy & Co. 1853.

NO ONE needs to be informed that what Cardinal Wiseman writes is always worthy of being read. As a man of varied and extensive learning, his reputation has long been firmly established on both sides of the Atlantic. Who has not heard of his celebrated "Lectures on the connection between Science and Revealed Religion," commended to attention in this country, twenty years since, by the late Professor Stuart of Andover? To thorough scholarship, he adds fine taste, and an exquisite sympathy with all that is classical and pure in literature and art. In both respects, his education is continental rather than insular European and not merely Anglican, uniting with English training the culture and learning also of Italy, France, Germany to some extent, and Spain. His writings in this way, have a character of teeming freshness and fulness, beyond what is common. Science, with him, is never cold and dry. The didactic, in his hands, encircles itself continually with flowers. Even where we find a want of care, as we do occasionally, in the style of some of his more hastily written pro-

ductions, we seldom miss the presence of a living flow of thought, which imparts to it, notwithstanding, an interest more eloquent than that of simply fine periods. As a general thing, however, he combines the eloquence of words with this richer eloquence of thought. In the use of imagery, he is often indeed exceedingly happy. Many are familiar with the beauty of his style, as it appears in his popular course of "Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church." For its own purposes, a book could hardly be better written.

The volumes before us are made up almost entirely of articles, originally published in the "Dublin Review;" which was started, it seems, in the year 1836, by a triumvirate, consisting of Quin, O'Connell and Wiseman, as an organ of Catholic principles and sentiments, with reference particularly to the theological movements of the time in the Church of England. The collection is so formed as to give each volume a somewhat separate character of its own. The first is more especially for Catholic readers, containing Scriptural essays and papers intended to unfold the significance of certain parts of the Catholic worship. Here will be found of particular interest two articles on the Parables and Miracles of the New Testament, and another at the close of the volume, on the Actions of the New Testament. The second volume is occupied with articles on the Oxford Controversy; while the third is made up of papers and essays of a more miscellaneous character—historical, artistical, archeological, and controversial. The second is of special interest and importance, as having to do with the most momentous movement which has appeared in the English Church since the time of the Reformation; for so, undoubtedly, the Tractarian controversy must be regarded, whatever opinion we may have of its merits. We have here in a series of essays, well worthy of being preserved, the argument of the Catholic Church ably maintained against the pretensions of Anglicanism, as set forth in the "Tracts for the Times," the "British Critic," and other so-called Puseyite publications. Seldom has the world seen a more interesting religious controversy. There was learning and earnestness on both sides; and the questions in debate were felt all round to be of the most profound and far-reaching practical concern. Cardinal Wiseman's share in the controversy, as presented to us now in these essays, speaks greatly to his praise. He shows himself throughout, mighty in learning, powerful in argument, uncompromising in principle, kind in spirit, and gentlemanly in manner. No wonder that such controversy should have been felt to car-

ry with it weight and force, in the minds even of his adversaries themselves. We find Dr. Newman more than once, since his conversion, acknowledging what he considers his own obligations to it in this view.

If it be asked now, what is to be thought of the actual merits of the discussion itself as a whole, we have no hesitation in saying that we consider the advantage to be completely on the side of the champion of Catholicism. The great body of the Protestant world can feel no objection, of course, to this admission; inasmuch as it refuses altogether to see or own in the Tractarian system, any true representation of what it holds to be its own proper cause. That system indeed itself disowns the cause of Protestantism in its common and general view; and any triumph it might be able to assert in its own favor would be taken for a defeat of this general interest, almost as much as the triumph of Catholicism itself. General Protestantism, therefore, will not count it any very serious matter, to be told that this particular shape or type of Protestantism has been found totally unable to maintain its ground in controversy with Cardinal Wiseman. Of the fact itself no one can doubt, who may seriously read these able articles from the "Dublin Review." Anglicanism, after the Oxford fashion, is here shown to be a system which cannot stand. It is necessarily destroyed by its own *premises*, or first principles. Grant these, and there is no logical stopping place short of the Catholic Church itself. Whether the system choose to be called Protestant, or refuse this appellation, as it does sometimes, affecting to be a simple continuation of one particular branch of the Church, in its own separate line, makes in the end no difference, as regards this point. In either view the scheme is inconsequential and untenable. To stand at all, Episcopacy must be Protestant, must plant itself on the Protestant principle; and this principle, by the very nature of the case, must be of wider force and range altogether than it is allowed to be by any theory of such narrow sort. All this Dr. Wiseman shows with overwhelming demonstration; and in such view it is, we may say, that the Anglo-Catholic controversy is fairly at an end. It is a matter now fixed and settled, that the cause of Protestantism can never be successfully upheld in *that* form. To place it on any such ground, is virtually to give it up as a mere schismatical usurpation of powers and rights that belong properly only to the Catholic Church. So regarded, its pretensions resolve themselves necessarily into sham.

It is much to know this. The case, however, involves more.

Tractarian Anglicanism is after all the only form in which it is possible to assert with any sort of consistency, the ordinary pretensions of the Episcopal Church, over against the position of other Protestant denominations. These pretensions are worse than idle, clearly, unless they can be made to rest on some such conception of a real Church, with really supernatural prerogatives and powers, as is maintained by Puseyism; and on this conception besides, as identified with an exclusively true line of succession, supposed to lie in the particular organization of the Episcopal Church. If it be found then, that the High Church theory cannot be carried out successfully in favor of Episcopacy, in the way that Puseyism has been trying to do it, Episcopalianism as a whole must be content to part also with the notion of any peculiar prerogative belonging to it in this way, in virtue simply of its outward constitution and order. To stick for anything of that sort, while refusing to accept the only theory on which it can be done with consistency, is a species of ecclesiastical pedantry only which deserves in truth but small respect. The controversy between Protestantism and Catholicism must hold now in another form. The question is not whether Anglicanism (or Episcopacy in any shape) in one direction, or Independency and rationalistic Zuinglianism in another, can sustain the full weight of this argument over against the pretensions of Romanism; for it is evident enough that they cannot do it; but whether it be possible to place the cause of Protestantism, under a truly churchly and historical form, on some ground intermediate between these contrary schemes, where it may be able to maintain itself without the inconveniences of either, so as not to fall over to the arms of Romanism on the one side, nor yet to become a prey to open deadly Rationalism, on the other. With this view of the Catholic controversy, these essays of Cardinal Wiseman, of course, do not pretend to meddle. They confine themselves to that one phase of it which belongs to Oxford and the Tractarian school. Here, as we have said, his victory is complete. But this only serves to throw the controversy over upon that broader and more free ground of which we have just spoken; while it goes to show, at the same time, what a world of interest is at stake on the form it must be made to assume here, as being nothing less in truth than the issue by which is to be settled in the end the universal question of the Protestant Reformation.

N.

JUSTO UCONDONO, PRINCE OF JAPAN. *By Philaethes.* Baltimore: Murphy & Co. 1854.

THIS volume of 344 pages, handsomely printed and cleverly written, is intended to represent, under the form of a tale, the general argument for the truth of Christianity in the first place, over against the claims of Paganism, Mohammedanism, and modern Judaism, and then for what the author holds to be the only true form of Christianity, the Catholic Church, over against all systems and forms of it besides. This is not, to our mind, the best form for either didactic or controversial divinity. Such mock disputations, carried on by men of straw, carry with them less persuasion and force, and have also less interest, generally, we think, than the same argument would have under a more direct form. For those, however, who have a taste for theology in such shape, the volume here noticed may be recommended as one well worthy of their attention. As regards the latter part of it, the argument, namely, for the Catholic Church, different readers, of course, will have different views, according to the state of their minds previously, in relation to the whole subject. The argument itself, does not pretend to be new. Its object is rather to make itself popular only and plain. N.

THE POWER OF THE POPE DURING THE MIDDLE AGES; OR AN HISTORICAL INQUIRY INTO THE ORIGIN OF THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE HOLY SEE. *By M. Gosselin, Director in the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris. Translated by the Rev. Matthew Kelly, Maynooth.* Two volumes, 8 vo. Baltimore: Murphy & Co. London: Dolman. 1853.

THIS highly respectable work forms the first and second volumes of the *Library of Translations from Select Foreign Literature*, a series of works now in course of publication by Mr. Charles Dolman of London, and the Messrs. Murphy & Co. of Baltimore. The object is to bring a number of valuable works, which have appeared lately on the Continent of Europe, in the service more particularly of Catholic Literature, within the reach of English readers in Great Britain and also in this country. The publishers propose to furnish annually, four volumes, octavo, of such choice literature, averaging from four to five hundred pages each, at the price of six dollars per annum to each subscriber. The undertaking certainly deserves encouragement. That there is room for a most valuable selection in this form, from the existing continental authorships of the old world, no one who knows anything about it needs to be informed; and it is just as plain that there is much need for it

also in the wants of our English theological learning at the present time. The great matter will be to make sure of good and sufficient translations. So far as that point is concerned, the work now before us speaks well. We have had no opportunity of comparing it directly with the original; but it reads smoothly, makes easy and clear sense, and in its general style moves freely and without constraint—the proper evidences in any case of a translation which is master at once both of its subject and its text.

We shall not pretend to go here into the merits of this work of Gosselin. That would demand a long article. Of its claims to attention, however, there can be no question. The name of its author, and the favor with which it has been received already in the continent, since its first appearance in 1839, are a sufficient guaranty of its worth. Its great learning and general ability show themselves on the whole face of the work itself. The subject, too, with which it is employed is one of the deepest interest, not for Catholics only, but for Protestants also; for all, in a word, who care to understand either the history of religion or the history of politics and civilization, in the wide and important period to which it refers. We may not be bound to accept the author's views at every point; but we *are* bound to make ourselves acquainted, as far as we can, with facts, (if we presume to have opinions,) and not to surrender ourselves blindfold here to the guidance of mere prejudice and ignorance. There is no subject more worthy of the study of the true scholar than the relation of the Papacy to the progress of society during the Middle Ages. The man who does not see and feel it to be of such interest, is not likely to be of much weight for the cause of either theological or ecclesiastical learning in any other view. It is humiliating, indeed, to find, to what an extent the grossest and most childish ignorance is allowed, even in seemingly respectable quarters, to take the place here of true knowledge; and how prejudice and lazy tradition, by a few sweeping and easily convenient formulas, are held sufficient on all sides to settle the most grave and solemn question in opposition to truth and fact, at the expense of what are self-complacently stigmatized as the dark ages. For the honor of learning it ought not to be so, as well as for the honor of religion. Over against all such unrespectable and inexcusable grannysm, claiming the right to rule history as well as theology by its pitiful formulas, we beg leave to recommend an honest and manly examination of the actual relations of the Church to the world in these medieval times, as they



are ably and learnedly set forth in this work of Gosselin. Let no one be deterred from doing so, merely because the title has to do with the "Popes." The inquiry after all regards the Church and Christianity as a whole; for be the case as it may now, it is not possible to separate between these and the Papacy during the Middle Ages. Christianity and the Church existed all that time in no other form. N.

A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE SACRED SCRIPTURES; IN A SERIES OF DISSERTATIONS, CRITICAL, HERMENEUTICAL AND HISTORICAL. *By the Rev. Joseph Dixon, D. D.* Two volumes in one, 8 vo., pp. 517. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. Pittsburg: George Quigly. 1853.

WHEN this well executed book was received from the enterprising publishers, our first impression was that the work was thoroughly scientific. Subsequent examination, however, has shown it to be of a somewhat different character. It is an attempt to reduce what has hitherto been presented in a scientific form, to a level with the medium popular mind. We would not undervalue it though, on this account. Such works, if of the right character, are much needed just now, and are loudly called for by the masses. The general spirit of our superficial and utilitarian age does not reach after pure science, except so far as this may be brought down to serve some selfish, practical purpose. The book now before us has thus, to some extent, been laid under contribution, to aid in the great Controversy on the Church Question, which has of late grown so immensely in interest and in the earnestness of the partisans engaged on both sides. It is freighted with much useful and interesting information, well suited to any common mind, that is at all awake to the pursuit of biblical study. But the principal object of its author, evidently, has been mainly to afford to the common Catholic, as well as to the ecclesiastical novice, an every day text book. On every point which comes up, in the many subjects treated of in the book, in regard to which there are differences between Protestants and Catholics, the author is especially anxious to forwarn and post up the faithful. The huge spectre of Protestant objections against the doctrines or practices of the Church, keeps him steadily in mind of bolstering up the dogma, even at the risk of omitting something else of positive interest and real advantage.

We are sorry that our limited space and want of time, forbid, at this time, a more thorough notice of the work, in presenting some thoughts suggested by its perusal. What was

otherwise intended, must, therefore, be postponed, at least for the present. Hoping that some other occasion may be given to treat of these matters more fully, we must content ourselves with giving a brief synopsis of the subjects considered in the book.

The miscellaneous character of its contents, of course destroys the unity of plan, if there be one, on which the work was gotten up. The loss sustained here, however, is doubtless more than made up by the comprehensive range of topics considered. Some of the dissertations are deeply interesting and instructive, while at the same time, there may be some parts flat and unsatisfactory to a Protestant reader. In proportion as it is well suited to the Catholic, and is popular in that direction, it will, almost as a matter of course, be objectionable to the ultra Protestant. And indeed few, except the faithful sons of the Roman bishop, will be convinced, by an *ex cathedra* declaration, on a mooted point, where the different branches of biblical science, and especially history, is expected to speak.

On the canon and the inspiration of Scripture, the author is, according to our notion, exceedingly meagre and unsatisfactory. On the form, the texts, the manuscripts, the printed editions, and the versions of the Sacred Scriptures, there seems to be more completeness. The notice of the English version, and the reading of the Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue, we found more interesting and curious than convincing. Biblical Criticism and Hermeneutics, are, of course, treated from the writer's own peculiar stand-point, which is conditioned by his Church relation.

The second general part of the work treats of the Physical Geography of the Holy Land, of the Political, the Sacred, and the Domestic Antiquities of the Jews. And finally, gives some account of Catholic commentators, and other writers on the Scriptures. From this it will be seen that it is something like such a work as Jahn's *Biblical Archaeology*, and Nevin's *Biblical Antiquities*.

The whole work amply repays a general perusal, or still more, a thorough study. It should be procured by all Biblical students, who have not, or who design not to have, other more extensive and thoroughly scientific treatises on the same subjects as herein considered. Persons who make such loud professions in favor of the Bible, would do well to get such helps whereby they may become better acquainted with it than many such are found to be.

R.

[Several Book Notices omitted for want of room.]